India

FOR THE

No. 32. New Series. No. 126. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, AUGUST 12, 1898.

Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News ... 81
Growing Distrust ... 84
The Recent Plague-Riot in the Punjab, by N. Gupta ... 85
A Soldier of Fortune ... 86
"Sherer of Cawnpore" ... 87
Our London Letter ... 88
Chronicle of the Week ... 89
The New Viceroy:
Some Press Opinions ... 90
Some Anticipations ... 91
From an Anglo-Indian ... 92
Illegal Impressment in the Punjab 92
India in Parliament ... 93
Et Caetera ... 95
Advertisements ... 96

NOTES AND NEWS.

Mr. Curzon is the new Viceroy. We do not wish now to anticipate the verdict of history by any gloomy vaticinations; we had rather dwell, as the morning papers do, on the more hopeful side. But the strain is extreme. Mr. Curzon comes to his great post with far more than the usual Viceregal equipment of special knowledge; he will work very hard, if his health improve and stand; and he will quickly emancipate himself from official trammels. It is true, as the *Times* says, that "caution is not everything in this world, and there may be times when courage is even of higher value." But the implication is not true; and what the *Times* calls "courage" seems to others only perverse rashness. A man that speaks gaily of meeting the Russians on the Oxus, and pronounces the Lawrence policy dead, can hardly be called courageous. We shrink from speculating on the impression that this ominous appointment will produce in India. It seems to mean the plain triumph of the Forward Policy, which Lord George Hamilton was compelled to throw over in the recent debates. We await developments, and can but hesitatingly join in the expectation that responsibility will bring caution. Still, let Mr. Curzon show his paces. We quote elsewhere a few journalistic opinions.

Mr. Curzon's record may be briefly summarised. He was born in 1859, the eldest son of Lord Scarsdale, rector of Kedleston, Derbyshire, by Blanche, the second daughter of the late Mr. Joseph Pocklington-Senhouse, of Nethershall, Cumberland. He was educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford, where in 1880 he took a first-class in Classical Moderations, and in 1882 a second class *In Literis Humanioribus*. In 1883 he won the Lothian prize for an essay on "Justinian," and was elected a Fellow of All Souls. In 1884 he gained the Arnold historical prize with an essay on "Sir Thomas More." During his undergraduate career he was a frequent speaker at the Union Debating Society, whose chair he occupied for one term. In 1885, when assistant private secretary to Lord Salisbury, Mr. Curzon unsuccessfully contested South Derbyshire in the Conservative interest, but next year he captured the Southport Division of Lancashire from the Gladstonian Liberals by a majority of nearly 500 votes. His majorities have grown at each successive election, and at the last general election, on a heavy poll, he defeated his Radical opponent by 764 votes. Mr. Curzon has travelled largely in the East, several times as correspondent of the *Times*, and his books on "Russia in Central Asia" (1889), "Persia and the Persian Question" (1892), and "Problems of the Far East" (1894), indicate both the extent and the character of his travels. The value of his contributions to geographical knowledge was recognised in 1895 by the Royal Geographical Society, which awarded to him its gold medal. In 1891 he became Under-Secretary for India, a post which he occupied till the fall of the Salisbury Administration in 1892. Since 1895 he has held the office of Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and in that year he was made a Privy Councillor. In 1895 he was married to Mary Victoria, the daughter of Mr. L. Z. Leiter, of Washington, U.S.A.

A correspondent writes:—"The *Daily Telegraph* calls on Lord Salisbury to appoint Mr. Curzon to the Viceroyalty of India. Now it is not very obvious why Mr. Curzon, who holds a position in English politics already distinguished, and of still greater promise in the future, should leave the Parliamentary arena for the splendid isolation of Calcutta and Simla. But there is a still stronger reason against this choice. We are told that 'the speech with which he summed up the purposes and results of the frontier campaign in India has seldom been surpassed for luminous analysis and masculine grasp'; so it has evidently never occurred to the *Daily Telegraph* that the frontier policy is still vehemently debated in India, and that, as has been shown by the reception of Mr. Thorburn's speech, not only the Indians themselves, but the bulk of the Anglo-Indian Press and officials are decidedly hostile to it. To send out to India, in the face of this, a man who not only strenuously supports the forward policy, but is ready to go far beyond anything that has been done hitherto, would be to flout the public opinion of India and to break with the tradition that at all events a certain appearance of impartiality as regards debated questions should be required in a Governor-General when first appointed. The nomination of Mr. Curzon would be a dangerous precedent, and would almost commit the Government to a new era of adventure at the very moment when such a policy has received so signal and general a condemnation."

The *Spectator*, in a rather interesting article, expresses the view that the great political need of the hour is not Imperial expansion, "no matter where and no matter how," but rather Imperial concentration. "We want," it says, "not merely to colour the map red, but to get all the advantages, political, material and moral, which come from the possession of a mighty Empire. For the last few years we have been steadily and, as we think, quite rightly, acquiring vast tracts of territory. What we ought to be doing now is developing and organising those tracts." And the *Spectator* thinks that the place where the greatest need for Imperial concentration exists is India:—

> India—including, of course, Burma—is still comparatively undeveloped, and the need for British capital is great and real. It is, we believe, a fact that men who can offer good and sound security have in India to pay 10 per cent. for a loan. In England men with money to lend are eager to lay it out even at 3 per cent. Before we go to war with Russia and waste, say, £300,000,000 because of the occupation of Port Arthur, or because of the possibility that under Russian auspices we shall not be able to do good trade with Manchuria—*i.e.*, in order to prevent any risk of our being injured in the Chinese market—surely we ought to make the best use of our Indian markets. If we spent on Indian railways and other public works the money which the extremer Jingoes want us to expend in a war with Russia we might get much greater benefits for our trade. No doubt the currency difficulty greatly complicates the problem in India, but even making allowance for that, we make, from the commercial point of view, comparatively little use of India and Burma. But till we have used our surplus capital in India, is it not foolish to be too sensitive about rumours that Russia will prevent the employment of English capital in China?

There are signs of grace in all this—especially in the central proposition that what India wants is development. But the *Spectator's* remarks exhibit none the less a characteristic mental squint. By all means let us "develop and organise" India, and "make the best use of our Indian markets." But that is a rather different process from, say, lending money at a guaranteed rate of interest to start railways which do not pay. When Englishmen talk of "developing" India, what they too often mean is squeezing the lemon for their own advantage, just as when they talk of giving India the blessings of civilisation what they too often mean is finding "a career for our boys." Surely, the only rational way to "make the best use of our Indian markets" is to increase the prosperity of the Indian people. Given the policy of retrenchment which India so urgently needs, her markets might, indeed, as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has never ceased

to argue, become profitable beyond the dreams of avarice. But that consummation will never be attained by devices to increase the economic "drain" from India to this country. To vary the metaphor, what the cow wants is food—not a new patent mode of milking.

It appears that Sir. W. Lee Warner's little book, "The Citizen of India" (which we noticed some time ago), is about to be introduced into the schools in India. If the rising generations of India, therefore, do not grow up with a firm faith in the infallibility of present methods of Indian administration, it will not be the fault of the India Office. On the one hand there is the new law of sedition, which aims at suppressing all hostile criticism, and on the other hand there is the schoolmaster abroad with Warner's safe cure, explaining everything, justifying everything. Those who know India and the people of India well will scarcely suppress a smile of incredulity at these elaborate preparations. Loyalty is not a hothouse plant which can be grown under a glass case by shutting out the keen air of criticism. Give India good government, and loyalty will grow as it did under a Lawrence and a Ripon.

It has often been pointed out that Burma, which is outside India, has been conquered at the expense of Indian taxpayers for the extension of British trade. We still hold Burma at a loss annually defrayed from the Indian revenues. Now there is talk of constructing a railway line from Mandalay to the heart of China. It is not difficult to foresee that the portion of any such line which would lie within Burma would be constructed at the cost of Indian revenues—or in any case the interest on the capital sunk would be guaranteed from Indian revenues. Sir Lee Warner's citizen of India, we suppose, will be taught from his boyhood that to promote British trade with China by constructing railway lines in Burma is a legitimate expenditure of the taxes which the Indian citizen pays.

Commenting on Lord Dufferin's speech at the annual Burma dinner, the *Champion* thus controverts his view that Upper Burma is "the latest jewel in the diadem of the Crown":—

In our opinion, it is nothing but a white elephant which eats away, even after thirteen years of its acquisition, something like a crore on an average per annum from the revenue of India proper, and, so far, events have justified Indians in their opposition from the very commencement of the annexation of the province to India.

Our contemporary, on the authority of the Blue-book itself, declares that so far from the conquest having been forced upon us by French intrigues, it was really due to the Manchester and Rangoon merchants, who desired the province as a market for English goods.

Lord George Hamilton, in his speech on the Loan Bill, declared that the railways in India were paying and were a most valuable asset. The *Champion*, on the contrary, tells us from official sources that since 1849, and including the estimate for 1897-98, the loss has been 57·75 crores of rupees from both guaranteed and State railways. In 1896-97, according to the *Gazette of India* of July 2, out of forty-one railways owned by the State only seven are paying. The net loss, after deducting the gains on these seven lines, is for the whole period since] their construction 26·16 crores. If to this we add the net loss of 9·77 crores on ten lines leased to companies, we have fifty-one railways, made at a cost of 160 crores, and on which the loss since their construction, in no case earlier than 1870, has been 36 crores. And this is Lord George Hamilton's idea of a valuable asset.

The *Hindu Patriot* discusses with moderation and judgment the question of further railway extension in India. The demand for railways in India is not like the demand in the United Kingdom. The *Patriot* points out that in 1896, while 980 millions of passengers travelled by rail in the United Kingdom, only 160 millions travelled in India. The lines already constructed are ample for the purposes of famine protection, and the *Patriot*, we fancy, is not far wrong when it says that the present demand for railway extension arises from English manufacturers, and that "in making this demand their object is not so much to benefit India as to benefit themselves."

Mr. Curzon, in a recent speech in the House of Commons, said that, if capitalists were unwilling to burn their fingers by constructing railways in China, it was unreasonable to expect the Government to burn theirs. In India there is a third party whose fingers can be conveniently thrust into the fire to draw out the chestnuts for the British manufacturer. When that enterprising person demands more lines in India, the Government of India spends the people's money, or guarantees profit at the people's expense, to oblige him. And Sir Henry Fowler beats the big drum in the House of Commons, and explains with persuasive eloquence that this is doing good to the people of India.

The Government of Bombay, as our readers are aware, took away all powers to deal with the plague from the Bombay Corporation, representing the people of the town, and placed them in the hands of an independent and practically irresponsible Plague Committee. How unwisely the Committee spent the people's money is well known, and the heritage of debt which it has left is now a source of anxiety. The *Bombay Gazette*, an Anglo-Indian journal edited by an Englishman, deals with the question in an impartial spirit, and the following remarks may be commended to the authorities:—

These specimens of the scandalous extravagance which the Corporation Committee has investigated and brought to light, ought to convince even a stony-hearted Finance Minister that it would be unjust to make the City of Bombay pay almost the whole of the heavy burden involved by the action of Government in handing the plague management to a Committee responsible to no one for its expenditure. Apart altogether from the misery wrought by the epidemic, the plague administration forms the saddest chapter in the financial history of the Government of the country during the whole of the expiring century.

In these circumstances is it wise to divest the people of Calcutta of their power over municipal expenditure and to place it in the hands of a foreign body of twelve men? This is the proposal of the Calcutta Municipal Bill, as to which the *Statesman* writes:—

The effect of the Bill would, in short, be, and is obviously intended to be, not merely to amend the constitution of the Municipality in respects in which it is manifestly defective, but to neutralise the elective element in the Corporation as far as the general body of the ratepayers are concerned, and two reflections must occur to every unbiassed critic who considers the position it will create. One is that it would have been certainly more honest, and probably not more impolite, to abolish ward representation altogether than thus to reduce it to a transparent farce; and the other is that if the ratepayers have any humour in them, every election under the proposed law would be a fresh challenge to their scorn and derision.

Although the Chief Justice summed up for a verdict of culpable homicide, the jury, composed entirely of Europeans, took what he called "a rather merciful view" of the case, and found the three soldiers accused of murdering Dr. Sircar at Barrackpur guilty only of inflicting grievous hurt. But to obtain a conviction and a sentence of seven years' rigorous imprisonment was a matter of some importance, when one considers the number of such cases which have ended in acquittals or small fines. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* gives expression to the merciful and forgiving temper of the Indians when, in discussing this case, it repudiates all sympathy with the barbarous maxim, "a life for a life," and ventures to hope that the conviction and sentences—and these constitute in themselves a serious punishment—may have sufficient deterrent effect.

There were several interesting points in the excellent summing-up of the Chief Justice, as reported in the *Friend of India*, which for those who can read between the lines, throw much light on the relations of the two races. Thus, to take one instance:

His lordship next drew the attention of the jury to the demeanour and manner in which some of the military witnesses gave their evidence. He did not know what sort of an impression was made on the minds of the jury; but it occurred to him that the evidence of Hart was not very satisfactory. In a case like this, even if the accused persons were soldiers, it was just as essential that members of their regiment—officers or otherwise—should give their evidence with the same fairness and frankness as other witnesses.

And again:

It would be mere affectation for one to pretend that there was not among a certain section of Native society a sort of feeling that in cases of this class matters were decided rather from racial views and sympathies than on the evidence in the case. It would be an insult to the jury's sense of justice and fair play—qualities which his lordship always regarded as among the highest attributes of his countrymen—because he was sure they would approach the considera-

order of his uncle, Dost Muhammad Khan, and how he had slain them at their own request with his own hand, and, lastly, how he had fled and become the outlaw I found him.

I sympathised deeply with the brave and persecuted man, whose eyes filled with tears when he recalled the dishonour of his family. The person of the chieftain was as attractive, and his face as handsome, as his stature was gigantic; his prowess in action I have never seen surpassed. His open nature abhorred Asiatic wiles, and thus he had easily fallen a prey to the machinations of his wily uncle, Dost Muhammad Khan.

Gardner married the daughter of one of Habib-ulla Khan's nearest relatives, a lady of royal birth on the mother's side; and Habib-ulla Khan made him commandant of a fort near his own abode. There he lived happily for two years. The tragic conclusion of this period affords a ghastly glimpse into the conditions of life there and then :—

The mullah silently beckoned to me to dismount and to follow him into the inner rooms. There lay four mangled corpses—my wife, my boy, and two little eunuch youths. I had left them all thoughtless and happy but five days before. The bodies had been decently covered up by the faithful mullah, but the right hand of the hapless young mother could be seen, and clenched in it the reeking *katar* with which she had stabbed herself to the heart after handing over the child to the priest for protection. Her room had been broken open, and, mortally self-wounded as she was, the assassins nearly severed her head from her body with their long Afghan knives or sabres. The mullah had tried to escape with the child, but had been cut across the hand and arm, and the boy seized and barbarously murdered. There he lay by the side of his mother.

I sank on my knees and involuntarily offered up a prayer for vengeance to the Most High God. . . . Rising, I forced myself and him (the mullah) away from the room, gave him all the money I had for the interment of the dead, and with fevered brain rode away for ever from my once happy mountain home.

The record of adventure must be read to be appreciated. With Urd Khan we should remember also Gardner's Therbah boy: "Whilst I slept," he says, "my Therbah sat watchful by my side, and no expostulation of mine could induce him to lie down and take rest." There must have been something "magnetic" about the daring wanderer, freebooter, and Dugald Dalgetty, to induce such fidelity to him personally, as well as to enable him to achieve so many escapes from all but certain death. There are varieties of the like adventure in Badakshan, among the Khirgiz, at Gilgit and Chitral, in Bajaur and Kafiristan, and other places, till at length in 1831 Gardner settled down at Peshawar as chief of artillery to Sultan Muhammad Khan.

In 1832, Mahárájá Ranjit Singh wrote to Sultan Muhammad Khan, desiring Gardner's services. "I myself," he writes, "would have preferred to remain at Peshawar, but Sultan Muhammad dared not refuse the Mahárájá." So he became the Mahárájá's chief gunner. His impressions of the Mahárájá are stated thus :—

Much as I had heard of the insignificance of his appearance, it at first startled me; but the profound respect with which he was treated, and the extraordinary range of subjects on which he closely examined me, speedily dispelled the first impression. The Mahárájá was indeed one of the master-minds which only require opportunity to change the face of the globe. Ranjit Singh made a great and powerful nation from the disunited confederacies of the Sikhs, and would have carried his conquests to Delhi or even farther had it not been for the simultaneous rise and consolidation of the British Empire in India.

The whole of this period of Gardner's service is most interesting, and much light is thrown on the inner workings of the time. It is unnecessary to trace the rivalries and atrocities consequent upon the death of Ranjit Singh. The story of the First Sikh War, as here related, is nothing less than amazing; and the Rani Jindan is a very striking figure. It was in 1842 that Gardner first met Sir Henry Lawrence. "I have often since," he says, "expressed my admiration of that great and good man, and of the tact and ability he brought to bear on his political duties." After the overthrow of the Khalsa army, Gardner was exiled to British territory, and soon afterwards he entered the service of Gulab Singh, the new Mahárájá of Jammu and Kashmir, where he remained till his death.

To offer mere outlines of such an adventurous life is even to outdo the man that presented the brick as a specimen of the house. The book must be read. The only other point we need notice is a remarkable letter written by Gardner at the age of 91, under the title of "A few plain, simple, and brotherly words from John Bull of India to his much beloved Aryan brother, the Right Honourable Sir John Bull of England." We make one or two notable extracts :—

Another fact, too, is recorded, with which you, dear John, must be familiar—namely, that India was famed in ancient times as one of the richest countries of the earth, the land of jewels and gold. Now all this wealth has vanished, and India to-day is actually impoverished, perhaps one of the poorest of all countries.

Now, my dear John, I shall ask you a plain and simple question—*Where has all this wealth gone to?* You surely do not consider us profligates or spendthrifts, who have squandered all our national belongings in frivolity and vanity? That, dear John, is not our traditional character. We are well known throughout the world as a thrifty and prudent race. You will hardly assert that we have been so mad as to throw our wealth into the sea; nor . . . . Then, dear John, to what quarter of the globe do you think it can have gone but to the West? In fact, some of our astrologers assert (though I can hardly believe them) that you have been adroitly milking the poor Indian milch cow to your heart's content from the day you first entered the country to the present time.

In return for the blood of India freely spilt in British causes, "you surely will not think it too much if we ask you to bestow on us three small favours" :—

The first of these is the full development of the natural resources of India, both mineral and vegetable. They are rich and varied, and can only be fully developed by means of a hearty and full measure of the necessary legislative initiation and encouragement: there is no doubt that you would soon be proud to see the happy results of such action on your part in an improved and modernised system of agriculture, horticulture, husbandry in general, and irrigation; and I further undertake that soon we should boast of our Manchesters, Leeds, Sheffields, and Newcastles.

Secondly, we earnestly request you to open for our preferment the door so long closed, and to give us access to the higher grades in the civil and military services. My dear John, it is mere folly, an unwise and unworthy subterfuge, to say, or affect to believe, that we have not clever and trustworthy gentlemen of high rank and proved respectability, fully capable of acting as Deputy Commissioners, Political Agents, Residents, or even Lieutenant-Governors; as well as Captains, Majors, Colonels, and Generals in the army. I can assure you that we have many scions of noble and princely birth, who, with a fair meed of encouragement, would soon qualify themselves for, and would prove a credit to, your civil and military service.

Our third and chief request is, that, for the future benefit of both India and England, we should be allowed to have representatives both in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, as well as in the Indian Councils of London and Calcutta.

My dear John, you often say that you have won India by the sword; but I beg to assure you that if you grant us these three requests you will fairly and completely win the hearts of your three hundred millions more or less, of Indian subjects.

We venture to think that these extracts are well worth thinking over, considering the "peculiar opportunities of ascertaining Native opinions" that Gardner had, as well as the shrewdness of the old warrior's judgment. A very useful appendix contains a short account of the white officers enumerated by Gardner in the service of Ranjit Singh.

"SHERER OF CAWNPORE."[1]

MR. SHERER has done well to republish in a more accessible form these chapters, which were originally contributed to Colonel Maude's "Memorials of the Mutiny." Without any pretension to give a connected history of the revolt, they are of great value as containing the personal observations of a fair and acute observer whose official position gave him the best means of knowing what was going on. When it is added that the author, after making his escape from Futtehpore, entered Cawnpore with the troops, just after the Nana had left it, and remained there reorganising the district till the end of the troubles, being thus brought into contact with Neill, Havelock, Sir Colin Campbell, Outram, and other famous men of the time, it may be judged that there is much in the book to arrest attention.

The Mutiny found Mr. Sherer magistrate and collector at Futtehpore-Hussowa, a district lying between Cawnpore and Allahabad. He gives a lively account of the first beginnings of the troubles. Those who are acquainted with the history of the Irish Rebellion of 1798, or, for that matter, of any rebellion, will find similar incidents occurring with a striking regularity. The first faint rumours of the coming storm, the ominous absence of crime, the desertion of servants, the stopping of the mail-carts—and then the storm bursts. One thing especially noticeable in the history of all such rebellions, and in none more than in the history of the Mutiny, is the great part that chance to all appearance plays in deciding on which side a man shall fight. It is impossible to read Mr. Sherer's book without seeing that many Indians who paid the penalty of treason had at first no thought of joining in the outbreak, while many others who remained

[1] "Daily Life during the Indian Mutiny": Personal Experiences of 1857. By J. W. Sherer, C.S.I. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., Ltd. 1898. 3s. 6d.)

outwardly loyal sympathised at heart with the other side. The Nawab at Banda girding himself with two swords and collecting his palace guards to defend the English officials, and in the end taken in arms with the rebels, is only an exaggerated instance of how, in such cases, outward circumstances determine the part men shall play.

At Futtehpore Mr. Sherer, having by great good luck, or by keen foresight, sent away his family in time, ensconced himself with the other Europeans in a large and defensible house to await events. The very last mail that arrived brought the news of his wife's safety. But his position soon became untenable. The days of waiting and the withdrawal, with the many adventures by day and by night, furnish the most exciting portion of the book. One incident, indeed, of a most painful character is connected with the withdrawal. The judge, from a heroic sense of duty, but, as the narrative clearly shows, without any justification in the facts of the situation, declined to accompany the party, and had to be left to his death. The fugitives themselves made good their escape; but it was not till after many adventures that Mr. Sherer found himself in Cawnpore. He entered in the wake of the army.

Of the causes of the Mutiny, the author says little. As for the participation of the peasants, something he attributes to the mere love of loot and license, and to the opposition of a poor and dissatisfied people to the Government as such; he pertinently adds: "This is the Nemesis of despotism, that the people are bred up to look on Government as boys look on a school-master: to be obeyed, if you must; and hoodwinked and cajoled, if you can." It is worthy of note that, as might have been expected, among those who opposed the English were to be found, to a man, those who had lost their land through the auction sales ordered by the courts; and these men long continued diligently to fan the disturbances. There is probably nothing in our rule so unpopular as the introduction of English laws for the recovery of Indian debts.

It is a charming characteristic of Mr. Sherer that he loves to look on the best side of things, to put forward the good qualities of his friends and to minimise the evil in his foes. Of what went on in Cawnpore during the Nana's government he is an especially trustworthy authority. He was almost the first European to visit the Well, and that at a time when everything was still as it had been immediately after the massacre. It is, therefore, all the more satisfactory to find him pointing out the exaggerations into which some writers have fallen. As for the mutilation of the victims before death, he declares it at once unlikely and unproven; while, if any mutilation took place after death, he believes it was done in robbing the dead, as in getting the rings off their hands. The subject is a painful one, but hardly more painful than the story of the outrages committed by the victorious soldiers, of which the author mentions more than one. Yet there is not to be found in him any trace of the mad rage for reprisals. Throughout he preserves a tone of fairness and a generous appreciation of the Indian character. The high value he sets on the official services and courage of a Brahmin who was one of his subordinates is very pleasant reading; and, generally, he seems to have treated the Indians he came across with a sincerity and respect that did not fail to secure their good-will. It is painful to have to ask if such respect for the Indians is a prevalent virtue among the Anglo-Indian civilians of the present day.

Touching the Nana, indeed, Mr. Sherer differs alike from the English who represented him as a monster of barbarity, and from the French, who made him out a strange mixture of cruelty, sensuality, and refinement. Mr. Sherer speaks of him as "a heavy, dull man with a grievance," who only joined the Mutiny after some hesitation. The author goes on:

> But the advisers of the Nana induced him to send messages after the Sepoys, and offer them ample monetary remuneration if they would return. They did return, and all the world knows with what results. Then the Nana's name became one to conjure with; but of his individual influence there seems no trace throughout. . . . . The stolid figure of the Nana himself remains in the background, rejoicing, doubtless, in the success of the treachery, and gladly consenting, probably, to the cruelty; but inanimate, incapable of original ideas, and more elated, perhaps, with the present glory of a hundred guns fired in his honour than with any distinct idea of future dominion. It remained so to the end; his death even was indistinct and insignificant, shrouded by the malarious Nepaulese forest, and producing little effect but the dispersion of a band of moribund vagabonds.

Mr. Sherer presents many interesting pictures of the English leaders, none perhaps drawn more clearly and convincingly than that of Neill, so determined to live up to his reputation for vigour and decision of character. But among the heroes, Outram stands out as the most heroic and generous spirit of them all. It is interesting to find him in 1860 talking over in cold blood his immortally chivalrous conduct in leaving the command to Havelock, and intellectually condemning it. "It was," he said, "a foolish thing; sentiment had obscured duty. Every man should carry out the task assigned to him." Equally pleasant is it to read the fine letter in which he made amends for his omission to make official acknowledgment of Mr. Sherer's services. He says: "I was then so overwhelmed with incessant calls on my attention that I overlooked it at the time; and the least I can now do is to express to you, in this private form, what I ought to have said officially, while yet I was in a position to address you officially." What an example is this to those who will never acknowledge a mistake or omission, and even prefer to leave a wrong unredressed! How invaluable to-day would be a successor to Lord Elgin with the Indian experience and the nobility of mind that distinguished "the Bayard of India"!

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

THE Session is, as I write, within a day or two of the end. Scarcely anyone remains, and of those who still come to Westminster obedient to the Government Whips, very very few trouble to enter the Chamber except at question time. The Session will end on Friday, but its sitting on that day will be purely formal, and Thursday is really the last working day of the Session. It would be incredible if previous experience had not shown that all things are possible with regard to Indian affairs in Parliament, but actually that last day of the Session has been chosen as the most fitting time for the consideration of the Indian Budget! It is perhaps just as well not to waste time in commenting on this. The mere statement of the scandal is bad enough, and no words could add to the effect. There are a few firm, good friends of India in the House, and year by year they do their best, but the vast majority know nothing and care nothing about India, except that it sounds well in perorations to call it the brightest jewel in the British Crown.

It is impossible for one who, like myself, hears the talk of members continually—I don't mean their public speeches, but their conversation—to ignore the rumours about Mr. Curzon. As I write this there are the most positive statements going about to the effect that Mr. Curzon will succeed Lord Elgin as Governor-General of India. Of course most men will feel inclined to laugh with incredulity, and then to protest vigorously. By the time this is in print the appointment may have been publicly confirmed, or publicly contradicted. For up to now it is nothing more than rumour. It would be easy to set forth a score of reasons why Mr. Curzon's appointment should be condemned. His youth, his jauntiness, his "cocksureness," his eagerness to come to blows with Russia, all this and much more that could be added, mark him out as just the man not to be sent to India.

At the same time I cannot agree with some who say that Mr. Curzon is not likely to wish to go. They say that India is the grave of reputations, and that Mr. Curzon is more likely to extinguish than to distinguish himself there. Well, I have a theory of my own about all this, which I give for what it is worth. I can well imagine Mr. Curzon being eager to go to India just at present. He is ambitious, he is no fool, and what he yearns for is the leadership of the Tory party, and for that he knows he must wait—and being young he can afford to do so. So far from snuffing himself out by going to India just now, I can well imagine that Mr. Curzon will increase his reputation with his party. He is shrewd enough to see that things are going from bad to worse with this Government. It will do an ambitious young minister no harm to be out of the way when the collapse comes. Of course nothing is certain in politics, but it is extremely probable that the Government will come to grief terribly when it appeals to the country. If this is so, then the disaster will be succeeded by recriminations between the two sections, and reputations will go in party shipwreck.

THE RECENT PLAGUE-RIOT IN THE PUNJAB.

By N. Gupta.
(*Editor of the "Lahore Tribune."*)

THE popular irritation caused by the measures, which have so far proved more or less abortive, for the suppression of the bubonic plague in India has, on more than one occasion, culminated in riots in different parts of the country. Sometimes these riots have had to be quelled by force, the armed police firing on the mob; at other times the rioters have dispersed before the arrival of the police or the military on the scene. On April 28 last there was a riot in the town of Garshankar in the Hoshiarpur district in the Punjab. The incidents of this disturbance were materially different from those of other outbreaks that have taken place in other parts of the country. In the case of other disturbances the facts came to the knowledge of the public at once. The trial of the rioters was open to the public, and the proceedings were reported in the newspapers. At Garshankar, immediately after the riot, the entire population, consisting of 6,000 souls, was turned out of the town and surrounded by a cordon of police. Entrance and egress became subject to passes issued by the local authorities, and any outsider seeking entrance was liable to be put in quarantine for ten days. The trial of the rioters was held inside the camp, and no newspaper reporter was present. Not even a letter was received announcing the result of the trial. The magisterial enquiry was finished on May 19, and copies of the proceedings have now been obtained in view of an appeal. Part of this appeal has already been rejected. The decision of the Punjab Government has been published in the shape of a letter from the Junior Secretary to Government to the Commission of the Jalandhar division, which includes the Hoshiarpur district. The point for decision was whether the police had fired upon the mob without orders though a magistrate was present. On the reports of the Commissioner and the local officers, his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, holds that no further enquiry is necessary.

Besides the legal responsibility one incurs in criticising plague operations, there is the pleasant prospect of the Lieutenant-Governor in the Legislative Council, or the Secretary of State for India in the House of Commons, energetically characterising a statement made by an outsider as "a malevolent invention." I shall confine myself, therefore, to the letter of the Punjab Government and the record of the trial.

The circumstances preceding and leading to the riot are briefly these. Early in April the medical officer reported that a part of the town had been infected, and should be evacuated. The inhabitants strongly objected, and the Commissioner of the Jalandhar Division, Lieut.-Colonel Massy, a most sympathetic and popular officer who had passed several years in the division and knew the people well, was of opinion that compulsion should not be employed, and that it would be possible to get all the infected families and several of the healthy inhabitants into camp. Sir Mackworth Young, Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab, approved of this policy of advice and conciliation. I am employing here almost the identical words used by the Government. There is evidence on record that applications were made by several inhabitants to the effect that they were willing to go into camp if they were supplied with materials for building huts. A fortnight later, however, Colonel Massy was gone, having retired from the service, and his place was taken by Mr. Silcock. Mr. Silcock reported that the facts were not in accordance with the understanding given to Colonel Massy, that the position in Garshankar was serious, and that the dead were being buried inside the houses. In these circumstances the Local Government gave discretion to Mr. Silcock to use compulsion for the evacuation of the infected area. The question that arises here is whether, before giving this discretion to Mr. Silcock, the Government had ascertained that an encampment sufficiently extensive to shelter the large population of Garshankar had been erected outside the town. The consequence was that when the entire population was turned out of the town, almost at the height of the Punjab summer, they had to stay out in the open until materials for building huts were provided.

On April 27 a proclamation, of which a copy is in my possession, was posted in the town calling upon the inhabitants to evacuate their houses the next morning, or by the evening at the latest. In this document the following sentence (the original being in the vernacular) occurs:—"And they (the inhabitants) will have to go to that place outside the city that we shall tell them (to go to) after fixing." It seems clear from this that no place had then been fixed, and no segregation or isolation camp made ready to shelter the inhabitants. On the morning of the 28th, to quote the letter of the Punjab Government, "Major Inglis, Deputy Commissioner on special duty, accompanied by all the officers on plague duty in the Hoshiarpar district and by Mr. Turnbull, District Superintendent of Police, with a body of 250 police, went down to the town in order to give effect to the orders by such force or show of force as might be necessary." Bearing in mind the fact that the inhabitants had time till the evening to evacuate their houses, one does not see the necessity for the police to come into conflict with them twelve hours earlier. A warning in the morning would have been sufficient, and the police might have held themselves in readiness to carry out the evacuation of the town by the evening. It is stated that while proceeding through the town one party of police were assailed by a shower of brickbats and by *lathis* (sticks), and the police, who were armed with carbines, fired on the crowd with buckshot, killing 9 and wounding 48 persons. "Of the police 26 received more or less severe bruises from stones and brickbats." The remarks of the Local Government may be here quoted:—

> The Lieutenant-Governor regrets that the firing of the police on the crowd took place without the orders of the officers in charge, and in spite of the attempts made by them (*sic*) to stop it. Admitting that they were hotly assailed while the party under Mr. Leslie Jones, Assistant Commissioner, and Mr. Hadow, Assistant District Superintendent of Police, were clearing the streets, and admitting also that the crisis was such as probably to justify the use of firearms by the police, the instructions issued to all deputy commissioners and district superintendents of police in 1895 provide that the senior police officer present is to determine in such cases the particular action to be taken by the police, and the particular weapons used; and it is contemplated that the use of such arms should be preceded by a special warning to the crowd and a specific order to the police, both to be given by such officer. The Lieutenant-Governor thinks it probable that if the police had been reminded beforehand of these orders and special precautions had been taken to provide for their observance in event of an attack (which under the cirucmstances was no improbable contingency) the riot might have been quelled with less loss of life. But this is the only criticism His Honour has to make. The conduct of the civil and police officers concerned when the riot occurred was worthy of all praise. They showed great calmness and presence of mind, and exerted themselves, as far as possible, to stop the firing and avert loss of life.

From these remarks it is clear that the police fired not only without orders but in positive disobedience of orders. Two officers, one a magistrate who was competent to give the order to fire, and the other a police officer, were present with the party of police, and they not only did not give the order to fire, but tried to stop the firing. "They exerted themselves, as far as possible, to stop the firing," that is, their exertions were not quite successful and they could not succeed in stopping the firing at once. Even this is not considered a serious breach of discipline on the part of the police. Now, any independent enquirer would lay stress on the point as to why the magistrate and the police officer should have tried, but not quite successfully, to stop the firing when the police were doing so in self-defence. It is stated that twenty-six policemen were more or less seriously injured (evidently before they fired) by the stones and brickbats thrown by the mob. The hospital assistant, who must have presumably treated the policemen for their injuries, was called as a witness for the prosecution during the trial of the rioters. He deposed to having treated only *two* policemen for their injuries: one of them was suffering from a fracture of a finger-joint, and the other had a flesh wound (the bone being untouched) on the forehead. Neither the statement of the hospital assistant, nor the record of the trial, gives the slightest information as to the nature and extent of the injuries sustained by the other twenty-four policemen. In the absence of this information, added to the important admission that the magistrate and the police officer present attempted, though unsuccessfully for a time, to stop the firing, I am driven to the conclusion that in the opinion of the officers present the situation was not sufficiently grave to justify the use of firearms by the police, and that they felt the police were exceeding their right of self-defence. I hold, therefore, that the matter should not have been

dealt with departmentally, that the policemen should have been placed on their trial, and it should have been left to a competent court of justice to determine whether in law the action of the police amounted to the exercise of the right of self-defence, or to manslaughter, if not homicide.

The riot took place on April 28. The rioters were arrested and the inhabitants turned out of their houses immediately afterwards. But it was not till May 14, or sixteen clear days after the riot, that forty-eight men were placed on their trial before a magistrate. The magistrate and police officer present with the party that fired were not called as witnesses for the prosecution. Apparently there was some difficulty in obtaining satisfactory evidence against the accused persons. In the course of his judgment the magistrate said :—

So difficult has been the position of investigating officers, and so loth have been the people to say a word against their fellow-townsmen, that it required a good deal of energy and tact in making the witnesses to depose and bear testimony to the real facts of the case.

This being so, there should have been no difficulty in getting a number of witnesses for the defence. But in point of fact they were absolutely undefended : no lawyer appeared on their behalf, no witnesses were called and none appeared. It must be remembered that all the inhabitants of the town were out in camp surrounded by a police cordon; that the population was in a state of panic and terror after the occurrences of April 28; that the magistrate was holding his court inside the police cordon; and it will be understood why the accused were undefended. One pleader, who went from Hoshiarpur to defend the accused, could not get access to the magistrate, and his experiences were so positively the reverse of pleasant that it is no wonder he did not persist in his disagreeable duty. Ultimately, after a trial of four days, several of the accused persons were convicted, and the rest were acquitted.

The light that the record of the trial throws on the working of the plague regulations at Garshankar, and possibly, therefore, in other infected areas in this Province, is almost lurid. The astonishing thing is that all these facts have come to light from the case as stated for the prosecution. There were no other witnesses but those that were called by the prosecution; there was no skilful counsel for the defence to cross-examine the witnesses, and to turn the powerful x-rays of a severe cross-examination on to the case for the prosecution. But the truth kept constantly coming up to the surface, and out of their own mouths, or the mouths of their own witnesses, have the local authorities at Garshankar been judged. The first thing that strikes one is the constant and almost hopeless conflict between the various orders given by the authorities on the spot, and the consequent uncertainty and suspense of the inhabitants. One officer recommends that the people should not be turned out wholesale, and the people are accordingly informed that they will not be compelled to evacuate their houses; a few days later comes another order that they must be compelled to evacuate their houses. Such instances might be multiplied, but I need not labour this particular point.

The principal witness for the prosecution is the Tahsildar of Garshankar, the local revenue, executive, and magisterial officer. From the statement of this witness it is clear that at first the inhabitants were most anxious and eager to co-operate with the authorities in keeping the town clear and taking every precaution against infection. Many of them were ready to leave the town and go into camp if supplied with materials for erecting huts. Several applications to that effect were presented, but some were rejected. One of the witnesses said that the people complained in a body that the heat outside the town would kill them. Up to very nearly the last the attitude of the people was not defiant or aggressive, but respectful. They were ready always to lay their grievances before the authorities. This is the statement, on oath, of the Tahsildar, and it has to be borne in mind in considering the remark of the Local Government that "it seems clear that the people had made preparation for determined resistance to authority."

The Tahsildar states that when inoculation was introduced in Garshankar people were unwilling to have their women inoculated with the plague *serum*, and they appear to have given the same advice to other villages. This was reported to the Deputy Commissioner in charge of the plague operations, and that officer, after summoning the headmen, told them they would have to submit to inoculation or they would be punished. I do not think the Deputy Commissioner had any authority for threatening the people in this manner. Plague inoculation being as yet in an experimental stage, no compulsion or menace can be used for its introduction, and the Government has expressly declared that inoculation is absolutely optional. Persons in Calcutta and Rangoon have been tried and imprisoned for giving out that people were being, or about to be, inoculated by force. It has to be enquired from the Local Government what notice is to be taken of the action of the Deputy Commissioner in threatening people with punishment unless they submitted to inoculation.

From the evidence of the Tahsildar and several other witnesses for the prosecution it is abundantly clear that on April 28, when the town of Garshankar was evacuated by force, huts to accommodate the 6,000 inhabitants were not in existence. There is no evidence to show for how many days the people had to camp out in the open, or when they were supplied with materials for building huts. I presume that this also was not within the knowledge of the Local Government at the time, and the public should be informed as to what action will be taken to prevent the recurrence of such a state of affairs in future.

As to the riot itself, in a place like Bombay or Calcutta the police would have charged and dispersed the mob without firing a shot. Here in the Punjab there is no guarantee that on any similar occasion in future the police will not again fire without orders in the presence of officers competent to give such orders, and in spite of their attempts to prevent the firing, as the conduct of the police at Garshankar has not called forth even a censure or an expression of grave displeasure from the Punjab Government.

Lahore, July 14, 1898.

A SOLDIER OF FORTUNE.[1]

"FAITHFUL to his standard, whatever it was," says Sir Henry Durand, "obeying without questioning military orders, Colonel Gardner presented and presents, perhaps, one of the finest specimens ever known of the soldier of fortune." After sketching Gardner's career, Sir Henry concluded that "the story of Dugald Dalgetty is nothing to this, as it will be seen by the light of times to come." Major Pearse has arranged in this volume Colonel Gardner's own memoirs of his experiences, with connecting and explanatory matter. Had all the Colonel's papers been preserved, "the tale of his career," as Sir Richard Temple says, "would have been as good as that which Othello told to Desdemona." Even as it stands, it is certainly an astonishing record. Born on the shores of Lake Superior, with Scottish blood dashed with Spanish in his veins, educated in Mexico, furnished with the brogue in Ireland, a wanderer and a fighter for a lifetime in Asia, Gardner died peacefully in his bed at Jammu in 1877, at the ripe age of ninety-two. A glance at his portrait, as taken at the age of seventy-nine, is enough to impress the martial vigour and diplomatic astuteness of this extraordinary man.

Abandoning in disgust his attempts to get service in Russia, Gardner "crossed the Caspian Sea, and entered on a career of adventure in Central Asia, from Kokan across the Hindu Caucasus to Herat, amidst ambuscades, fierce reprisals, hairbreadth escapes, alternations between brief plenty and long fasting—amidst episodes sometimes of brutality and cruelty well-nigh inconceivable, at other times of hearty charity and fidelity unto death." Such is Sir Richard Temple's excellent summary of Gardner's experiences from 1819 to 1830, from his 34th to his 46th year. The remarkable kindness of Urd Khan, on a caravan march from Andkhui to Khiva, when Gardner fell ill of brain fever, deserves a lasting memorial. "Urd Khan swore that no harm should touch me," he writes, "and nobly did that generous and disinterested Asiatic redeem his pledge." He gives a very striking picture of Habib-ulla Khan:—

He told me how he had been plundered, how grossly his mother had been treated, how his two lovely sisters had been violated by

[1] "Memoirs of Alexander Gardner, Colonel of Artillery in the service of Mahârâjâ Ranjit Singh." Edited by Major Hugh Pearse. With Introduction by the Right Hon. Sir Richard Temple, Bart., G.C.S.I. With portrait and maps. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.)

tion of this case without allowing themselves for one moment to be swayed or influenced by any such considerations. He was perfectly satisfied that there was not one of the jury who did not fully recognise that the humblest and poorest Native was as fully entitled to the protection of the law as the highest European in the land, and he was perfectly satisfied that the jury would carefully approach the consideration of this case irrespective of the fact that the men in the box were Europeans.

But here is a case, perhaps, even more instructive than that at Barrackpur, in that the hero was not an ignorant soldier but an engineer, presumably a man of education and position. According to the magistrate, as reported in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, the facts were these:—

About 10 p.m. on April 30, a wedding-party, consisting of some twelve persons, with three musicians, arrived at the house of the bride. The house was situated on a spot which did not belong to Mr. Macintyre, though it was opposite his bungalow. As is the custom in this country, the arrival of the party at the bride's house was announced with the beat of drums which accompanied the procession.

Mr. Macintyre and his sick wife were just going to sleep, so he sent two *chaprasis* to stop the music. But before they returned, he himself went out with his gun, loaded it, and according to his own account fired one barrel in the air to frighten the revellers. Immediately after, the second barrel went off—the accused said by accident—and seven of the wedding party were shot, one mortally.

We shall here let the magistrate speak for us: "He (Mr. Macintyre) keeps and uses a gun. He must be assumed to understand the mechanism of that weapon and the possible effects of a charge of heavy shot fired from that gun. In my opinion, it is a rash act to fire off a gun, loaded with what are practically bullets, at random on a dark night. What justification is there for accused to go up to a crowd of merry-makers with a loaded gun with the intention of making them cease from playing music and moving off? He approaches them in the dark over rough ground, with his gun pointed towards them, and with the trigger at full cock."

The accused was fined Rs. 800.

It may be noted in the first place that the injured persons in the beginning declared the matter an accident, and did not wish to prosecute, which the magistrate gave as a reason for subsequently refusing to credit their testimony; but it is suggested that "people prefer to avoid a European," especially when he is aggressive. Secondly, the injured were all shot in the back, which shows that they were moving off. Thirdly, Mr. Macintyre, even after this tragic termination, seemed to think his original interference quite justifiable. As the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* says:—

Here let us remark parenthetically that apparently Mr. Macintyre had no right to send his *chaprasis*, or to come out himself to stop a wedding festivity which was being held in his neighbourhood. It was no excuse that, because his wife was ill and his sleep was disturbed, therefore he should use force and stop a sacred ceremony which was a nuisance to him. It is extremely unreasonable that others should go without music, so necessary in a marriage ceremony, because Mr. Macintyre did not like it.

The acquittal of Alfred Charles Parker is regarded by the Native Press of India as a virtual failure of justice. He was charged with hurling down a Native woman from a height into the bed of a river twenty feet below, and the matter is explained away as accident. A yet more barbarous case is now under trial. Private Whelan, of the 2nd Connaught Rangers, is charged with the murder of a punkah coolie by running him through the abdomen with a fixed bayonet. The case was enquired into by Mr. Oakden, Joint Magistrate of Meerut, and the accused was committed to take his trial for murder and culpable homicide before the High Court of the North-West Provinces. The result of the trial will be awaited with interest; but the record of such cases in India is becoming quite sickening.

We regret to hear of the death of Sir Asman Jah, K.C.I.E. Sir Asman has long been an important figure in Hyderabad, indeed ever since the death of Sir Salar Jung, and he was the Prime Minister of the State for five or six years from 1887. His death on July 16 last will be widely regretted in Southern India.

Many a civilian in India, as well as many others, will hear with deep regret of the death of the great "coach," Mr. Walter Wren. Mr. Wren had long suffered from a spinal affection of a distressing character caused by a kick he received at school. Yet he worked indomitably through Cambridge, in the face of his physical discouragement, and with only an apology of a degree, he set himself to make his living as a coach. This is his own description:

You see me deformed and paralytic, a constant sufferer from neuralgic pains. I was kicked in the back when I was a boy at school. I broke down with disease of the spine when I was an undergraduate. I had to take only an ordinary, not an honour, degree, and that an "ægrotat," *i.e*, I was too ill to go to the Senate house, and was examined in my bedroom. Since that time I have spent the greater part of my life on an invalid couch. You see, I can only get across the room with the help of two sticks. My recovery is almost miraculous. Over and over again I have been pronounced a hopeless case by doctors, but I never struck work nor despaired. Thanks to the tender care and watchful attention of my first and second wives, I survived it all. When I started as a private tutor I had to find my own buildings. I had very little "prestige," but rather the want of it. I could not give my degree as a proof of my competence, so I had not that recommendation. What was on the other side? What advantages have the schools? They had free buildings, rich endowment, the prestige of centuries, all the most promising boys, teachers who had graduated with the highest honours. The only pupils I got at first were those the schools neglected. Surely my system had something good in it.

The difficulties Mr. Wren surmounted would have overwhelmed any man of ordinary nerve. He has himself told how he worked away, year after year, with his boys, "sometimes lying on my back, sometimes on my face. I had a special couch made," he said, "to lecture on as I lay on my face." As his success was proved again and again in the examinations, he was called "crammer, charlatan, crimp, impostor, and a lot more." Yet he toiled on, and his success was signal. For several years 50 per cent. of his pupils passed the examinations, and in the last year of the old regulations he passed nine candidates out of thirteen. He was hardly less successful in the examinations for the Army and Home Civil Service, though his main strength was given to the Indian Civil Service. The fact is, he was a strong-headed teacher, and no "crammer" at all. He thus expressed his contempt for crammers, and for his public schools opponents as well:—

The popular idea of a crammer (said Wren on one occasion) is that of a man who stuffs his pupil with knowledge as they fatten chickens, by means of a tube through which prepared food is forced into their gullets. But there is a difference between crammers and chicken fatteners, for the pupil of the crammer, instead of growing fat like the chicken, is expected to be able to secrete, or rather to exude on examination day, the material with which he has been previously gorged. Anything more utterly opposed to true education could hardly be imagined, unless, indeed, it be the system, inefficient, slovenly and contemptible, which prevails at most of our public schools.

Mr. Wren's method was well considered, and strictly enforced. He quickly saw what was in a man, and took his measures accordingly, in thoroughly businesslike fashion, and with an iron rod of discipline. Thus:

A good lady came to me with her son, and at the close of a long interview, in which she had represented him as possessing all the virtues of an unfallen archangel, she casually enquired about his religious training. I replied: "Madam, you pay me to prepare your son to pass the competitive examination for the Civil Service, not for Paradise. If your son is all that you say of him he stands in need of no religious training;" but I went on to say: "There is no place in which your son will be more sharply looked after from a moral point of view than with me, for I have three golden rules which are enforced inexorably—first, pay in advance; secondly, no money returned; thirdly, work or go.

And again:

The moment I find any pupil weakening or impairing his chances of success at the examination—and every failure at an examination, be it remembered, brings discredit upon my teaching—I am down upon him. I don't preach to him and discourse solemnly upon his fate in the next world if he continues to indulge his passions in this. I say to him there and then, short and sharp: "Look here, my boy; you stop that, or you go. Your father has paid me to put you through, and if you do as I tell you I will put you through; but if you won't, I keep your money and send you about your business."

Besides his scholastic work, Mr. Wren was deeply interested in politics. He was a strong Radical, and contested several constituencies, unsuccessfully. He was also elected a member of the first London County Council, "solely upon public grounds, without canvassing, or being personally known to the constituency." He was a well-known figure at the Reform Club, and he was one of the six founders of the National Liberal Club. His death took place with tragic suddenness, and at an unfortunate moment; for he was struck down with paralysis as he was starting to leave his house to go to the church to see his daughter married to his colleague and successor—Mr. Thomas M. Taylor, Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge.

GROWING DISTRUST.

It is becoming a commonplace in all discussions on the state of India that the relations between rulers and ruled are growing steadily worse, that the officials are inferior to their predecessors both in sympathy with the people and in knowledge of Indian ways of thought and life, and that they no longer have the same trust in the subject population; while the people on the other hand find the rulers more inaccessible, and their motives more difficult to gauge. Distrust begets distrust; and the two races on whose harmony so much depends find themselves separated by mutual ignorance and mutual suspicion.

It has become almost a mania with Anglo-Indians to see sedition everywhere. If an Indian who has been educated after European methods dares to utter the maxims of government which he has learnt from his conquerors, it is the worst disloyalty. He may be a man of high culture whose whole future is bound up with the stability of British rule in India—it is no matter. These products of British Empire and education find no favour in official sight. If, on the other hand, an Indian mob breaks out into riot, it is the result of some deeply-laid scheme. If a fool or a fanatic attacks an English official, it is, at the very least, the sign of a plot to overturn the British Empire in India. With such ideas as these prevailing among the rulers, it is not to be wondered at that trifling incidents are treated as serious dangers, and measures taken in panic which outrage all the Indian's most cherished feelings. And so, in avoiding imaginary dangers, real ones are created. The Indians are treated as seditious, their wishes are set at naught, their customs interfered with, and as a result they become—not seditious, indeed—but unsettled, suspicious and distrustful. Were they not by nature a people prone to obedience, even to a fault, the effects might be still more serious. As it is, this mutual distrust is answerable for a long series of miseries and disasters.

Take, for instance, the measures adopted to prevent the spread of the plague. Could there be a more triumphant vindication of the principle that nothing can succeed in India without the support and co-operation of the Indians? The Government began with rigid ordinances conceived, no doubt, in accordance with the best scientific prescriptions, the examination of suspected cases, the removal of the sick, the closing of their houses, and the segregation of their families. Those in authority thought it a sufficient vindication of their conduct to show that everything had been done with the sole view of stamping out the epidemic on the most approved scientific principles; while the people were treated as clay in the hands of the potter, as slaves whose wishes and feelings might be disregarded if they seemed to conflict with the great work in hand. And yet if the earliest plague regulations be compared with the latest, it will be seen that these wishes and feelings have conquered in the end, and that it is now recognised that for any measures of prevention to be effective, they must be supported by popular approval and co-operation. It is painful to think how much suffering and ill-will might have been saved, and how much more effectively the plague might have been fought, if this cardinal truth had been recognised from the outset.

But not only does the history of the recent plague show us the necessity of taking into account in all rules and regulations the habits and feelings of those who are to obey them; it shows even more strongly how much depends on the men by whom such regulations are enforced and how much sympathetic officials can effect. Those who had the privilege of hearing Mr. Chambers, of the *Bombay Champion*, at the recent breakfast given in his honour, will remember the striking contrast he drew between plague operations in Bombay under General Gatacre, and under his successor. Mr. Chambers said:—

> While General Gatacre was at the head of the Plague Committee, everything went well. After he retired everything went ill. General Gatacre personally saw all things for himself, and he never allowed anyone to do the more delicate work—such as house searching and so forth—unless he was certain that those he thus employed were competent and sympathetic. The General would go with soldiers, it is true, but the soldiers were not allowed in the dwellings of the people; there were kept on one side—to be used, if force were required, against the bad characters which are to be found in all large cities—but thanks to his tact and large-heartedness force never was wanted. General Gatacre would give the children sweets, he would reason with and gain the confidence of the parents, and he employed the educated to explain to the ignorant.

And this contrast has been repeated, in the reverse order, at Poona. At that place under the administration of the unfortunate Mr. Rand, there was turbulence and ill-will; under that of Colonel Creagh there was peace and contentment. It would appear to be usual with Anglo-Indians to look on every outbreak of turbulence as certainly the fault of the people of the country, if not the direct result of their innate wickedness and ingratitude; but the Indians are proverbially patient, and the history of these events at Bombay and Poona proves that in each case the conduct of the people depended on that of their rulers. Given General Gatacre at Bombay, all was peace. Riot followed the measures of his successor. Given Mr. Rand at Poona, there was opposition on all sides—an opposition which vanished before the kindly methods of Colonel Creagh. Could there be a more forcible object lesson on the need of knowledge and sympathy in the rulers of India, or on the terrible consequences which may result if the present ignorance and distrust be allowed to continue unchecked?

But to check this distrust seems to be far from the intentions of the Indian Government. Ignorance and misunderstanding can only be cured by greater knowledge; but the Government seems anxious to cut off even such small means of information as are at present open to the alien rulers of the country. Its efforts seem directed rather to the suppression of all independent thought and criticism. The Press is shackled; and those Indians who show a disposition to take part in public affairs are misrepresented and abused. Educated Indians, the creation of the British connexion, men whose consequence and, in some cases, whose very livelihood depend on the existence of the British Empire in India, are accused of disloyalty if they venture to express their views on the policy of the Government, or to point out the dangers which may arise to Indian interests. The Anglo-Indians, indeed, are never tired of telling us that the educated classes are out of touch with the great mass of their countrymen, that their interests and their thoughts belong to a different world; but even if this were so, they would still know more about those among whom they were born, and to whose customs they for the most part conform, than do the English strangers who are eagerly awaiting the moment when they can say good-bye to India for ever. His new interests, indeed, attach the educated Indian the more strongly to the rule of the English, his position is the best pledge of his loyalty, and if he has acquired an insight into Western ways of thinking—such as his birth and early associations have already given him into Eastern ways—so much the better fitted is he to be the interpreter between East and West, between the toiling millions of India who have themselves no voice, and the proud strangers who have assumed the task of ruling a people of ways of thought and life so dissimilar to their own.

In no case is this unfortunate state of feeling shown more vividly than in the attitude of the Anglo-Indians towards the National Congress. The organisers of the Congress are men whose position forces them to be loyal, and whose English education is the best possible guarantee of their good faith and loyalty to the English connexion. But it is becoming an established maxim with the Indian Government that all criticism is seditious, and that no one can find fault with officials or official measures without having at heart the blackest designs against the English power in India. Rightly used, the Congress would afford the Government a fruitful source of information, and an excellent opportunity of showing confidence in the Indian people. But when the Indians see this body treated with hostility and contempt, they naturally view the motives of their rulers with an answering distrust, and find in the Government's dislike of even the most moderate criticism strong reasons for suspecting it of designs which cannot bear the light. So distrust begets distrust, and the evil increases, poisoning the relations of the two races, and rendering impossible that co-operation between them without which there can exist neither good government, nor prosperity, nor enduring progress.

camp attendants, without reference to the question whether these can be procured by free contract or not. And, unless common rumour is altogether at fault, a few years ago the legal member of the Viceroy's Council, who had shortly before recorded a minute pointing out the illegality of impressment, failed to procure by voluntary engagement the carriage and attendants which he required for a trip in the Himalayas, and insisted on impressment being carried out by the district officer of Simla, who in vain referred him to his own minute.

Few who are well acquainted with India will urge that impressment is never required; and those who oppose legislation on the subject maintain that hard and fast rules will have a tendency to harden and prolong the duration of an evil which may otherwise gradually cease to exist. On the other side, it is contended that the illegality of the practice leads directly to gross abuses, and to the burden being placed almost exclusively on the backs of those who are too ignorant to know their legal rights or too weak to enforce them; that the requirement of extra rates of payment for impressed carriage will bring about the gradual disuse of the system; and that in any case it is a scandal that English officials should be called upon to authorise acts not only unjustified by any law, but expressly forbidden under severe penalties by the Penal Code.

Commenting on this letter the *Manchester Guardian* wrote:—"Mr. Thorburn, the Financial Commissioner of the Punjab, in his now famous attack at Simla on the conduct of the late frontier war, declared that 100,000 animals and 25,000 owners were pressed in the Punjab, and Lord Onslow, when questioned in Parliament on this point, made no attempt to dispute the facts, but maintained that what had been done was justified by certain Bengal Regulations of 1806 and 1825. Our correspondent points out that these regulations were repealed so far as the Punjab was concerned in 1872. It is a scandal that the Government of India should sanction measures which seem to be clearly illegal; and it becomes all the worse when, as in this instance, the hardship illegally inflicted falls on those who do not know the law. And what are we to say of impressment conducted on such a wholesale scale as that described by Mr. Thorburn? The revised scheme of the Tirah operations provided for the employment of 16,000 baggage animals, chiefly mules. But, as Mr. Thorburn says, no fewer than 100,000 mules were pressed, and of these not more than one-sixth were actually sent to the front. Not only was the law violated, but it was violated in a perfectly indiscriminate manner, by people who were evidently ill-informed as to the necessities of the case. We hope this count will not be forgotten among the others in Mr. Thorburn's indictment."

The *Times* of Saturday (August 6) published the following telegram from its Simla correspondent:—

Lord Onslow's reply in the House of Lords to Lord Northbrook's question regarding Mr. Thorburn's lecture is incorrect. There is no statute or authority for impressment in the Punjab, the Province wherein it is most practised in war time. It is not only illegal, but is a penal offence under Section 374 of the Indian Penal Code. Impressment both in time of peace and war was legalised in Bengal and Bombay by Regulations passed at the beginning of the century, but these never applied to the Punjab.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, August 4.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the First Lord of the Treasury when the Indian Budget would be taken.

Mr. Balfour: The Indian Budget will be taken after the Committee stage of the Appropriation Bill, probably on this day week.

Friday, August 5.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT.

Mr. J. Havelock Wilson asked the President of the Board of Trade whether the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steamship "Carthage" was a British vessel, registered in a port in the United Kingdom; whether such steamer was subject to the provisions of the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, with regard to the accommodation for seamen as provided for under part II, section 210, of the Merchant Shipping Act; and whether part II, section 210, applied also to vessels registered elsewhere than in the United Kingdom as provided in section 261.

Mr. Walter Long: Yes, sir. The P. and O. steamer "Carthage" is a British vessel registered at a port in the United Kingdom. The Board of Trade are advised that such steamer is generally subject to the provisions of the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act, respecting accommodation for seamen, except with regard to natives of India shipped under Indian articles. But the point is not free from doubt, and is receiving consideration. The answer to the concluding paragraph of the question is in the affirmative, subject to the exceptions provided by the section.

Mr. Havelock Wilson asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he would take immediate steps to ensure the observance of Section 210 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, upon all British registered vessels carrying Lascar or Asiatic crews; and whether, in the event of shipowners violating such section of such Act, he would cause proceedings to be instituted for the recovery of the fine provided for by the same section.

Mr. Long: I understand that in every case of a violation of Section 210 of the Merchant Shipping Act the Board of Trade disallow the deduction from tonnage. If that action does not produce the desired effect, they do not hesitate to also prosecute in case of necessity. But with regard to Lascar or Asiatic crews shipped under Indian articles, I have already explained the position in reply to the hon. member's previous question.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Mr. Lewis asked the First Lord of the Treasury when the Indian Budget would be taken.

Mr. Balfour: I should be extremely surprised if the day on which it is taken does not turn out to be Thursday. As the hon. member knows, Monday is the last day for Supply; the first reading of the Appropriation Bill will be taken on Tuesday, the second reading on Wednesday, and the Committee stage on Thursday. The Indian Budget will be taken after the Committee stage.

ILLEGAL IMPRESSMENT IN THE PUNJAB.

Mr. Pickersgill asked the Secretary of State for India, whether there were any statutes or regulations having the force of statutes which authorise the impressment of her Majesty's subjects in British India for the commissariat service in connexion with warlike operations on the frontier; if so, would he give the reference to these statutes or regulations:

And, was the recent impressment of 25,000 men in the Punjab for the commissariat service made under the authority of any and, if so, which of these statutes or regulations?

Lord G. Hamilton: The right to impress for purpose of war throughout India is based upon immemorial usage and custom, and has been invariably resorted to in the Punjab, as elsewhere, whenever the circumstances seemed to require it. In certain parts of India the practice has had, in addition, the sanction of specific legislation, and for some time past a draft Bill dealing with impressment in the Punjab has been under consideration in India, but, as I now learn, it has not yet become law. As to the number of men and animals impressed during the recent operations, I am expecting a report from India, but I have reason to think that it has been much exaggerated.

THE SUBSIDY TO THE P. AND O. COMPANY.

Mr. Havelock Wilson asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, whether he could state the amount of subsidy paid by the Admiralty to the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company for cruisers and transports for conveyance of troops during the year 1897.

Mr. Hanbury: The amount paid to the Peninsular and Oriental Company during the year 1897 for the conveyance of her Majesty's mails, including parcel mails, was £353,794.

THE INDIAN MERCHANT SHIPPING.

Mr. Havelock Wilson asked the President of the Board of Trade, whether the Indian Merchant Shipping Act applied only to vessels registered in India and employed in trading to and from ports in India:

Whether he could state the number of cubic feet of spacial accommodation allocated to each seaman under such Act:

Whether he was aware of the fact that a movement had been and now was on foot in India to increase the spacial accommodation allocated to Indian seamen up to the standard provided for under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894:

And, whether he was aware that the principal opponents of such movement were the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company.

Mr. Havelock Wilson also asked the President of the Board of Trade, whether, in view of the fact that the Board of Trade was considering the subject of the statutory accommodation allocated to Lascar seamen, they would take into consideration Part II, Section 124, of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, and state whether such section does provide that the provision of the Act respecting agreement applies to all seamen whether engaged in a British possession or in a foreign port.

Mr. Walter Long (who replied for Mr. Ritchie): Generally speaking, seamen engaged on British vessels are subject to the Act of 1894, even when engaged in British possessions or foreign ports. Section 125, however, contains special provisions with regard to natives of India. The question of the exact application of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act depends upon the subject matter, and involves points of considerable intricacy with which I am not prepared to deal within the limits of a reply to a question in this House. In the case of Lascars, I understand that the Indian Act requires six superficial and 36 cubic feet of space for each man. In the case of Europeans, a space of ten superficial feet is required when the space is 6 ft. or more high; 60 cubic feet if it is less. The Board of Trade have reason to believe that proposals have been made in India to increase the space allocated to Indian seamen, but they are not aware of the nature of the opposition raised to such proposals or from what quarter it emanated. Section 124 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, does provide that the provision of the Act respecting agreements applies to all seamen, whether engaged in a British possession or in a foreign port, subject to the modifications contained in the section and any qualifications arising from local legislation based on Imperial law.

Dr. Clark asked whether, in the case of the Peninsular and Oriental Company, who had steamers sailing from London to Australia and back, the shipping of Lascars in India was not an evasion of the Act?

Mr. Long said that was one of the points on which the Board of Trade was unable at present to express a definite opinion. The

whole question was now being considered by the Board of Trade in order to ascertain precisely the state of the law.

Dr. CLARK: May I take it that when they get the information they will prosecute the Peninsular and Oriental Company? (Laughter, and "Order, order.")

No answer was given to the question.

Monday, August 8.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

STATE REGULATION OF VICE.

East India (Cantonment Regulations,—Copy presented—of instructions issued by the Government of India on the Cantonment Regulations, published October 15, 1897 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INDIA OFFICE STORE DEPOT BILL.

India Office (Store Depôt) Bill,—Lords Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.

INDIA AND THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE.

On the motion of Sir M. M. BHOWNAGGREE a Return was granted for "Copies of the Further Reports on the Indian Section of the Imperial Institute issued by the India Office since the publication of the Return of April 21, 1896."

OFFICERS FOR STAFF EMPLOYMENT.

Mr. PIRIE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in view of the recently granted addition to the pay of officers of the Indian army whilst studying at the Staff College, and in view of the desirability of the standard of qualifications for appointments on the staff of the Indian army being maintained at the same level as for similar appointments at home and in the colonies, he was prepared to take steps to bring the Indian army regulations on this subject more into accord with the Queen's regulations than they were at present.

Lord G. HAMILTON: It is true that the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief have a wider discretion in selecting officers for staff employment than the authorities in this country, as the conditions of service in India are frequently in themselves a valuable test of an officer's efficiency; but I am confident that in the exercise of that discretion they give due weight to the possession of a staff college certificate, and I am not prepared to initiate any change in the Indian regulations on this subject.

Tuesday, August 9.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions against State regulation; from Wood Green and Woolwich; to lie upon the Table.

STATE REGULATION OF VICE.

East India (Contagious Diseases) (No. 2, 1898),—Copy presented of a General Order issued by the Commander-in-Chief in India, on July 14, 1897, regarding the means of checking venereal diseases among the British troops in india [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT asked the Secretary of State for India if he would commend to the consideration of the Indian Government the example set on August 1, 1898, by the Dominion of Canada, in the admission of imports from the United Kingdom and India, or containing 25 per cent. of British labour, at a reduction of one-fourth the duty leviable upon foreign goods.

Lord G. HAMILTON: In view of the circumstances under which the import duties now in force in India were imposed, and of the relatively small proportion which they bear to the value of the articles imported, I am not prepared to recommend the reduction of them suggested by the hon. member.

THE PLAGUE AT GARSHANKAR.
POLICE FIRING WITHOUT ORDERS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that, on April 27 last, the Assistant Commissioner on plague duty ordered the 6,000 inhabitants of Garshankar to leave the city within twenty-four hours; that not sufficient number of huts had been erected outside the city to shelter these people from the excessive heat; that a disturbance arose in carrying out these orders; and that the police fired upon the people without orders, killing nine and wounding forty-eight:

Whether forty-eight of the survivors were prosecuted and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment:

And, whether he would cause enquiry to be made by some impartial authority into all the circumstances of the case.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN said he wished to supplement the question by asking whether it was the fact that the police refused to stop firing when ordered to do so by their European officers.

Lord G. HAMILTON: As soon as it became clear that the plague had established itself in Garshankar, every form of persuasion and inducement was used in order to bring about the voluntary evacuation of the town; but as these means failed, it became necessary at the end of a month to issue positive orders. As to the number of huts provided, I have seen no allegation that it was insufficient. A body of police, on entering the town to enforce these orders, was violently attacked by rioters, and twenty-six of them were more or less seriously injured; they fired in return, with the result that nine rioters were killed and twenty-seven wounded. I have received no information as yet as to the number of rioters who were prosecuted or the nature of their sentences; but as at present advised, though I deeply regret the loss of life which occurred, I see no reason to order a special enquiry.

As to the supplemental question, the police were subjected to a most violent assault and they did fire without orders, but in a very few seconds, I may say, their officers were able to control them. I do not think they were in any way to blame for firing under great provocation.

THE P. AND O. COMPANY AND THE MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT.

On the report of supply,

On the resolution to confirm the vote for salaries and expenses of the Board of Trade,

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON called attention to what he considered an offence against the Merchant Shipping Act on the part of the Peninsular and Oriental Company. That Act required 72 cubic feet of space to be set apart for the accommodation of the crew, but the company only allowed 36 feet. In reference to this subject he had put several questions to the President of the Board of Trade, but had failed to get a satisfactory reply. In answer to his question, in which he mentioned the particular instance of the steamship "Carthage," he was informed that the Lascar crew were engaged in India and came under the Act passed by the Indian Council, which allowed only 36 feet. For vessels on the Indian coasting trade this was sufficient, because the climate allowed men to sleep on deck. These vessels, however, traded between India and the United Kingdom; they were owned and registered in London; the company received £360,000 from the Government for carriage of mails, which subsidy enabled them to drive out of the India trade a large number of British steamers formerly employing British seamen. He contended that the company's vessels came under the Imperial Shipping Act, and that that was irrespective of where the crew were engaged. He hoped the right hon. gentleman would be prepared to make some promise that the Government would do justice in this matter by enforcing compliance with the Merchant Shipping Act upon this particular company.

Mr. WALTER LONG said he could only answer the hon. gentleman upon the information he had been able to gather since he had undertaken to answer questions on behalf of his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade during his absence from the House through indisposition. The Board of Trade were entirely at one with the hon. gentleman in desiring that such provision as was considered necessary under the Merchant Shipping Act for seamen should be made in every case. But they were advised that, under the Act of George IV, sailors engaged in Indian ports should be exempt from these regulations as to space. The officers of the Board of Trade had assured him of the desire of the Department that suitable accommodation should be provided, and recommendations to this effect had been urged on the Indian Government, which had not, however, seen its way to carry them out. The Board of Trade was still considering the matter, and it was impossible for the hon. gentleman to drive the Department beyond that.

On the return of the Speaker after the usual interval,

Mr. MADDISON said it was surprising that the Lascars on board British ships should have only half the accommodation which was given to British seamen. He could not understand how the Government permitted such a state of things. Many of these Lascars were brought from India and re-engaged in British ports. He thought it was absolutely necessary that the House should have convincing proof from the Government that they would at least encourage the employment of British seamen. Turning to the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, the hon. member suggested that the *Labour Gazette* should in future contain in each month a list of all Government and other accessible publications dealing with trade and labour, giving their titles and prices. He also complained of the treatment of local labour correspondents of the Department, which he described as shabby in the extreme. It was impossible for them under present conditions to give the time requisite to obtain full information.

Dr. G. B. CLARK said that the First Lord of the Treasury some days ago gave a pledge that the legal position of the P. and O. Company should be defined. He thought it was only fair to that Company to say that they generally gave 60 cubic feet to the Lascars. There might be some doubt as to their ships trading to India, but there could be no element of doubt raised as to their ships sailing from London to Australian ports. What he protested against was that they should permit the P. and O. Company, to which they paid a high bounty for carrying the mails, to transgress an important section of the Merchant Shipping Act. Now they were at the end of the Session and nothing had been done. He looked at the question from the point of health, and it was a shame that the Board of Trade had taken no steps before now. He begged to remove the reduction of the vote by £100.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot do that. I have already put the question that the House do agree with the resolution.

Mr. HENRY BROADHURST said it had now taken the Board a twelvemonth to consider the question, and it had not yet been able to decide what was a British ship and what was an Indian ship. How could they ask that the P. and O. boats should have all the advantages of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act and also all the advantages of the subsidy from the British Treasury? Although the Lascar was not an Englishman, he was a human being, and wanted breathing space.

Sir A. FORWOOD said the question of subsidy ought not to be mixed up with that of the manning of the ships. The subsidy was paid to the company for performing certain work for the Postmaster-General, and there was nothing in the contract providing how the vessels carrying the mails were to be manned, or how the crews should be accommodated. The bulk of the vessels proceeding through the Suez Canal to the East carried Lascar crews, and carried them under the same conditions as were observed by the P. and O. Company. He had never heard any complaint as to the accommodation provided for the Lascar crews on the P. and O. ships.

Mr. LOWLES, speaking from personal observation during many voyages in P. and O. vessels, said that the Lascar crews employed by the company in question were exceedingly well treated.

never had any occasion, so far as we know, even to consider any matter of high finance; and he is hardly the man to cope with the extravagant demands of the Indian military party. From these points of view his appointment is difficult to justify. On the other hand, youth is not in itself a fatal bar to success, even in a position of such magnitude. And Mr. Curzon knows India well, and will not have to get up his case from the briefs officially supplied to him, or to be found on the shelves of a library. . . . It may well be—many of his best friends assert that it is—that in Parliament he has defended from loyalty a policy of which he disapproved from conviction. . . . . When he is much more the master of his own policy a different man may be revealed. We must hope so. Finally, he risks his whole future career on this one shining peak. Unless he makes a great success he will make a very great failure, and five years hence he will be politically a nonentity. His acceptance shows, at any rate, the pluck we are all so ready to admire."

The *Daily Telegraph* (August 11): "We have already stated our estimate of Mr. Curzon's capacity for this great and important office, and the grounds upon which we advocated his election have, we are glad to observe, been readily admitted by many of those who have since commented on his qualifications." And, in a special article: "Hardly anyone who has followed Mr. Curzon's remarkable advancement in the political world can resist the feeling that his immense capacity for hard work and his unquestionable power and varied attainments, apart from his extended travels, qualify him for the great office bestowed upon him."

The *Standard* (August 11): "No one who has watched Mr. Curzon's conduct in the House of Commons as Under-Secretary of State in two Departments, would think of denying that he is pre-eminently fitted for the Viceregal dignity. . . . . Neither Mr. Curzon nor Sir William Lockhart will be accused of an inclination to revive the exploded fallacies which sufficed for the disciples of Lord Lawrence. . . . . It will be Mr. Curzon's duty, with the assistance of his colleagues and with the support of the Secretary of State, to initiate a revised order of things in frontier management. . . . It is understood that Mr. Curzon will receive a peerage before starting for India."

The *Daily News* (August 11): "We are not without hope that Mr. Curzon will soon live down the reputation which, rightly or wrongly, he has earned of favouring a restless policy. . . . 'Not cannon, but character,' says Mr. Curzon; not cannon, we may add, but contentment. If this be the spirit in which the new Viceroy has accepted the great responsibilities of his office, he will carry with him, not only the congratulations of his many friends, but the good wishes of all who are zealous for the maintenance and fame of the Empire."

The *Morning Post* (August 11): "We entertain no doubt that Mr. Curzon will maintain the best traditions of the high position he has been summoned to occupy. His appointment is a personal triumph almost unique in Parliamentary history."

Some Anticipations.

The *Manchester Guardian*, of August 10, published the following from its London correspondent:—"A confident report is current that Mr. G. Curzon, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, has been actually appointed to the Viceroyalty of India in succession to Lord Elgin, whose term of service is expiring. As long ago as April 6 I announced that Lord Salisbury's choice for the Viceroyalty lay between Mr. Curzon and Lord Balfour of Burleigh, adding that the appointment would be personally acceptable to the member for the Southport division, who was, and is, quite content to retire for a period from home politics in order to take part in the administration of our Indian Empire. Enquiry made in various quarters to-night leads to the conclusion that the report current has been widely accepted as true, and at any rate as highly probable. Mr. Curzon himself was at home during the evening, but it was stated to a caller that he was somewhat indisposed and had retired early. A precise statement touching the report is therefore not forthcoming, but the occurrence of an early election in the Southport division should surprise nobody. Naturally the gossips are exercised over the notion that Mr. Curzon should be willing to cut himself adrift from his brilliant prospects at home for an appointment so important even as that suggested. Some of the Jingo school openly assert that the true meaning of it is that Mr. Curzon, like Mr. Chamberlain, is disgusted with the Chinese policy of this country and is anxious to escape from the storm which they allege is about to burst upon the Government in this connexion. Another section compare the proposed appointment of Mr. Curzon to India with the actual appointment of Sir Alfred Milner to South Africa. It is said that in the present serious position of foreign affairs Lord Salisbury is anxious to place the government of our greater dependencies in the hands of men who have been practically in touch with the secret aims of his policy. Whatever may be the motive of the appointment (if it has really been made), the critics are by no means unanimous that it will be an unmixed advantage to India, and there are those who recall the fact that the late Lord Lytton went to the East with nearly as high a reputation as that of Mr. Curzon. The latter, it is pointed out, has an overwhelming belief in the mission of Great Britain to dominate the Far East, and though he is too well-informed a man to believe in the possibility of a Russian conquest of India, he is obviously anxious about the possibilities of a Russian invasion. This, it is said, is hardly the temper which will give the needful check to the excessive militarism of the Viceroy's Cabinet, and perhaps a less brilliant nomination would have given more confidence to those who may be considered the best and wisest friends of India."

The *Westminster Gazette* wrote (August 10):—"What sort of man would one naturally nominate after our recent experiences in that country? First of all a financier, who would approach the tangle of Indian finance with knowledge and special skill. Secondly, a man of weight and authority who could stand up to all encroaching military gentlemen and refuse to be pushed into a forward frontier policy by any exaggerated alarm about remote dangers. Thirdly, an experienced administrator who would be on his guard against crude remedies for occasional disturbances. Therefore, to fill the post we choose a brilliant young debater, who has indeed travelled in India, and served an apprenticeship at the India Office, but who so far as anyone knows is innocent of finance, is certainly identified with the forward policy, and is likely to be in general sympathy with the military gentlemen who have recently done such considerable mischief. Mr. Curzon's career at home seemed fairly marked out. He has steadily advanced of late in the esteem of the House of Commons. He is a good debater who has added to natural eloquence an admirable adroitness in the art of fence. His manners were in the beginning not popular, but the House has discovered that they meant nothing, and in these days it likes him better than most young and successful men. He seemed destined for a career of unbroken prosperity in the House of Commons, ending in due course in the highest office, when time and events should have taken him hereafter to the House of Lords. All these qualities, or most of them, will be wasted in India. India at this moment does not want a talking Viceroy, or even a very clever one. She wants a sober, middle-aged gentleman with a cool head, and such insight into men and character as experience alone brings. If recent accounts are true, there are a good many things to be set right at Simla, and a new *régime* is the natural opportunity for setting them right. Incompetent people have clearly managed to get into conspicuous places, and will by some means or other have to be reduced. The Anglo-Indian newspapers have for months past been calling attention to the laxity in high places which has brought disaster in moments of stress. Reform of this kind is not an agreeable business for any man, and least of all for a young man of little experience except in the House of Commons, who will find himself face to face with senior men claiming to have long experience. Yet a reforming Viceroy is a necessity if the country is to be saved serious trouble, and Mr. Curzon will have to play the part if he goes. We are far from saying that he will not rise to the occasion. A man of all-round ability will only show what he is capable of when he is tried. Yet an appointment of this kind must, though we concede Mr. Curzon all the virtues and all the talents, be a perilous experiment for him, for the country, and for India. Lord Salisbury has tried Mr. Curzon and knows him, and Lord Salisbury, if he makes the appointment, will take the responsibility. Mr. Curzon has at least one qualification which in the near future must be of importance to an Indian Viceroy. He knows the Far-East question from personal experience, and must have clear ideas about the importance of China to India, and the necessity of establishing communications. This certainly from the point of view of high politics is not to be despised."

The Parliamentary Representative of the *Pall Mall Gazette* (August 10) said:—"Mr. George Curzon was the centre of interest in the House of Commons and the lobby yesterday. Recent vaticinations of the *Pall Mall Gazette* connecting him with the Viceroyalty of India had been practically realised: at any rate it had become humanly certain that he would be selected as the successor to Lord Elgin, and the House was by way of congratulating the Under-Secretary on his presumed good fortune. The idea was very well received, and not by any means the last to express pleasure at the rumoured appointment were the members on both sides of the House who commonly speak for the Indian people. The circulation of the announcement disclosed how popular Mr. Curzon really is, and it may safely be said that no member of the House has been greeted with such hearty goodwill on promotion as Mr. Curzon has been."

The *Star* (August 10) wrote:—"In all this, it will be seen, the matter is discussed from the point of view either of what would suit Mr. George Curzon, or of what would suit the Olympians at Simla. But, after all, there is another party interested in the matter, namely the people of India; and we do not hesitate to say that, regarded from their point of view, the gift of the Viceroyalty to Mr. George Curzon would be at once a burlesque and a calamity. Was it not John Bright who said—we forget the exact words—that no human being had the capacity required in the Viceroy of India? But there are degrees, and to appoint a man of Mr. Curzon's calibre would be a burlesque and an insult to the Indian

people. Nor is that all. As even the *Pioneer* points out, Mr. Curzon is publicly committed to the most extreme of all the extreme doctrines of the 'forward' frontier school. At the beginning of this Session, when everybody was talking *piano* about the humiliating war with the Afridis, Mr. Curzon remorselessly and recklessly defended a policy by which, as he said, he hoped to see British-Indian soldiers and Russian soldiers facing each other across the Oxus. Could anything be more fatuous or more perilous than to send out a visionary of this kind to take the controlling hand in the administration of India, especially at a time when trouble is once again simmering beyond the border, and the 'forward' policy is denounced even by repentant Anglo-Indian journals? Dr. Mommsen thinks that Russia may one day take India. The 'forward' school holds the same view, and, holding it, beggars India to keep Russia out, and gags India to help Russia in. If Russia ever does take India, depend upon it, it will not be *via* the North-West frontier. It will be through an insurrection of the people—a very different matter from the military revolt of 1857. Now it seems to us that if this is what our Government desires it cannot do better than appoint Mr. Curzon Viceroy. What is wanted to keep India loyal is sympathetic government. Is Mr. Curzon sympathetic? Imagine his 'superior' attitude on such matters as the law of sedition, the relations of officials and people, and the suppression of the plague. Again, what is wanted is retrenchment, which postulates a sane frontier policy. But Mr. Curzon's frontier policy is mere midsummer madness. Nothing more calamitous and nothing more grotesque could befall India than that Lord Salisbury and his colleagues should treat it as an arena for the sport of a young gentleman like Mr. George Curzon. The folly is too great to be believed—even of *this* Government. It might suit Mr. Curzon. But how about India?"

FROM AN ANGLO-INDIAN.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent, who has had special occasion to weigh and compare the public character and personal qualities of Viceroys and Governors, sends us the following reflections on the new Viceroy:—"There has been more than usual difficulty in deciding who shall be the next Governor-General of India; and just now, as I write, the demi-official or officious Press has nominated the present smart Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who is clever enough as politicians go. As to statesmen, that is *une autre chose*. Having known much about the policy and personal influence of eight Governors-General, and having seen all of these (except the first), I might, if you allowed me space, be able to describe what a Governor-General ought to be. But such combination of choice qualities as that description would imply would be regarded as 'too bright and good for human nature's daily food'. So let us keep within the roll of common men. The position is even now, though for different reasons, as onerous as it was when John Bright, in 1858, made the great speech in which he suggested the decentralisation and federalising of Indian Administration, leading up to the abolition of the post itself. He said: 'I believe the duties of the Governor-General are far greater than any human being can adequately fulfil. He has a power omnipotent to crush anything that is good . . . . while as to doing anything that is good, I could show that, with regard to the countries over which he rules, he is really almost powerless to effect anything that those countries require.' Now, in presence of this grand, almost overpowering conception of the functions of the chief Executive ruler of India, where does the Hon. G. N. Curzon come in? And how does the verdict stand with regard to the four failures out of the eight I have known—though two of these were brilliant men? That strain is too high for us in the present day; and Providence is merciful in that modern communications and other circumstances have rendered the problem of choice less difficult and perilous. The grand old designation of Governor-General is too large for the functions of present-day Viceroys, who in all matters of high policy are only 'the other end of the wire'. They are figure-heads, masters of ceremonies, and speech-makers. So that much of the *Telegraphese* expended last Tuesday on the present nominee is beside the mark; and, to adapt one of the terms of that premature laudation, it may be said, of the present-day Viceroy, that what is wanted *is* 'an ornamental personage, merely a gifted and ambitious man.' Thus your 'gifted' and fluent Under-Secretary may serve as well as any one of half a dozen others.

"Still, after all, for 'doing anything that is good' there is yet much scope for the chief Executive ruler—not of, but in, India. But what are the qualities and motives that would make a modern Indian Viceroy a power for good? First and foremost, he should be a man of such experience and maturity of character that he could be relied on to maintain and exercise such judicious independence as is compatible with present conditions, which, as explained above, are greatly narrowed. Next, and all through, he should be imbued with determination to work out Bright's truly imperial proposition: 'You may govern India if you like for the good of England; but the good of England *must* come through the channels of the *good of India*.' Mr. Curzon cannot have learned so much as the alphabet of this supreme lesson; and it would take him all the five years to arrive at its grammar. Besides, there is the patent disqualification that he has already gone utterly wrong into that evil path of blundering policy which has reversed all the conservative counsels of the wisest Anglo-Indian statesmen. If he, or whoever may be chosen, were a man of genius who would make his acceptance conditional on thorough reversal of that blind and ruinous policy, then there might be hope of replenishing 'the channels of the good of India.' That seems past hoping for; though there are indications that some two or three men in high places have come to see the utter folly of the course pursued since 1876: and as the real authority over Indian affairs is here, and nowhere at Simla—there is yet a chance to save our Indian Empire. Now, if you were to let me fill your paper, no more could be said: 'I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say.' Adieu."

ILLEGAL IMPRESSMENT IN THE PUNJAB.

The *Manchester Guardian* of Friday last (August 5) published the following letter from an "ex-Judge":—

There seems to be at last some chance of an old-standing Indian abuse coming to the notice of the English public, and of some reform being in consequence effected. Lord Northbrook called attention in the House of Lords to a statement made by Mr. Thorburn, Financial Commissioner of the Punjab, to the effect that 100,000 animals and 25,000 owners had been impressed in the Punjab for the recent frontier operations, that impressment was practised in the Punjab without discrimination and without system, and that of the men and animals impressed last October not one in five were sent to the front. The Under-Secretary for India, Lord Onslow, blamed Mr. Thorburn for the public expression of his views, and maintained that the practice of impressment was legal under certain Bengal Regulations of 1806 and 1825, and he added that that code had been applied to the whole of India. Were the India Office authorities, who drew up Lord Onslow's answer for him, ignorant that those Regulations were repealed, as far as the Punjab was concerned, twenty-six years ago, by Act 4 of 1872, sec. 4? But, further, Lord Onslow went on to say that under those Regulations it was the duty of the Governor General in Council, in case of war, to call upon the landowners in the districts through which the troops would pass to furnish the necessary supplies, and in case of their failing to do so they were liable to fines. Regulation XI of 1806 is entitled a Regulation for facilitating the progress of detachments of troops through the Company's territories, and certain powers were given for that purpose. There is nothing in these Regulations which has reference to the sort of wholesale impressment referred to by Mr. Thorburn for the purposes of a campaign; the men, it is true, are paid, but they are ordered to go, whether they are willing or not, by authorities the limits of whose legal powers they do not know, and whom they dare not resist.

Mr. Thorburn is blamed for his public attack on the system of impressment, but over and over again officials, of whom the present writer was one, have in vain, within the limits of official discipline, urged the necessity of reform. Forty years ago there was a prospect of something being done; a Bill was introduced into the Legislative Council and an interesting debate took place, in which speaker after speaker related stories of abuses of the practice of impressment which in a less serious matter would have been ludicrous. The question was still pending when the outbreak of the Mutiny of 1857 turned the attention of the Government to more pressing affairs.

But in later years Punjab officers have from time to time represented the illegality of the frequent impressment of carriage and carriers and the need of reform. The practice was not confined to times of war. If Lord Onslow wants an instance to the contrary, let him call for all papers during the last twenty-five years relating to the impressment of carriage and carriers in connexion with the movements of troops to and from the Himalayan station of Dalhousie, in the Gurdaspur district of the Punjab. This is one of the best known instances of hardship, as the population affected was sparse, and troops moved at times of sowing and harvest. And some five or six years ago it was the duty of the present writer to decide, as judge, an appeal which directly raised the question of the legality of impressment of carriers in connexion with these movements of troops. The question was important from an administrative standpoint, and the Government was given an opportunity of maintaining the legality of the practice, but it did not attempt to do so. Lord Onslow will further find that the whole question was exhaustively considered about 1885 and 1886 by the Government of the Punjab, on representations made by, among others, the present writer; but nothing was done. And not only the military authorities were in the habit of demanding carriage, which could not be procured except by impressment. Viceroys and other high officials have to be supplied with carriage and

Mr. Curzon will be out of all this, and when he comes back after four or five years it is extremely probable that the Tories will be looking for a leader. He will be remembered as a man who made his mark in the Commons, his faults will be forgotten, it will be remembered that he had nothing to do with the final fiasco, and he will be hailed as the saviour of his party. I give this, as I have said, simply as my view. And of this we may be sure, if Mr. Curzon wants to go to India he will get the place. English governments are nearly always more concerned to let a man have the position who wants it, than to send a man who is likely to fill it wisely and well.

There is another point in connexion with this matter, a minor point, but after all one that should not be overlooked. Mr. Curzon married an American lady, a member of a millionaire family, sister indeed to the young Mr. Leiter, whose speculations in wheat have caused such widespread mischief and misery. Now we can all see what a temptation it must be to a Chicago young lady who has been brought up amid the gaudy grandeurs of an American multi-millionaire's home, to pose as a sort of deputy-Empress of India. The sensation which would thrill young friends in Chicago, a sensation in which admiring despair struggles with jealousy, would be sweet indeed. And, seriously enough, a man's wife has no small share in these appointments.

I made it clear last week that the Government was getting into a terrible mess with its Vaccination Bill, and at the end of last week it came to the House of Lords. Everyone knew that there would be a tussle in order to strike out Mr. Chaplin's clause recognising the conscientious objector, a clause put in in a panic on the eve of the Reading election. Nearly the whole of the Tory press implored the House of Lords to save the Government from itself, to strike out the clause, and if possible to wreck the Bill altogether.

The debate which ensued was remarkable for two speeches, and for the result of the division. Everyone had expected Lord Lister, the great surgeon, to oppose the Bill, or at least the interpolated clause. He did nothing of the sort. He supported the Bill, and said that though it was a great experiment he thought it was more likely to do good as it was than as it was originally introduced. It was a remarkable and an impressive speech. But much more remarkable was Lord Salisbury's. There were parts of it which showed that the rumours about his private sympathy with some of those who have been persecuted in connexion with this law are not unfounded. Lord Stanmore had with easy confidence declared that as no notice was taken of conscientious objectors to medical laws in India and Ceylon, the same contempt for people's feelings could be shown here. This is how Lord Salisbury replied:—

> There is the knowledge that children—and a considerable number —have succumbed to the operation of this beneficent law, and the feelings which are worked upon are the deepest, the tenderest, the most tenacious and difficult to overcome of any in the whole range of human sympathies. It is idle to tell me the people are wrong, or that they are deceived; as long as they have feelings they will resist. They are Englishmen, and it is no use to quote to me the precedents of India and Ceylon to show the way in which their prejudices are to be overcome.

That is a remarkable passage. As I heard the words I could not help thinking of the people of India whose deepest and tenderest and most sacred feelings have sometimes been left to the tender mercies of Tommy Atkins. But our statesmen don't trouble about them. There is a world of meaning in Lord Salisbury's words, "they are Englishmen, and it is no use to quote to me precedents of India and Ceylon." That makes all the difference. As I pointed out last week there is the theoretical possibility of impressing men and animals in this country, but it is not done. They are impressed by the thousand in India. Again, in this country vaccination has been compulsory according to the theory of the law, and one-third of the population have treated it with contempt. In India our medical regulations are carried out in a much more rough-and-ready spirit. So Lord Salisbury was right when he said it was of no use to quote precedents about India.

Who, for instance, supposes that if any discretion, any recognition of those feelings so eloquently alluded to by Lord Salisbury had been shown at Garshankar a few months ago, the miserable state of affairs brought to light by a question put by Sir William Wedderburn on Tuesday would have been possible? We have seen how tenderly the Prime Minister regards the conscientious objector in England (and I am glad he does). Let us now look to a precedent in India of the sort of which Lord Salisbury says it is useless to remind him. The Assistant-Commissioner enters Garshankar on April 28, he orders 6,000 of the inhabitants to leave within twenty-four hours. The heat was excessive and shelter had not been provided. A disturbance naturally enough arose, nine Natives were instantly and fatally shot, forty-eight others were severely wounded, and nearly fifty more were sentenced to long periods of imprisonment. And when Lord George Hamilton was asked to have an impartial enquiry made into the matter he replied, "I see no reason for a special enquiry." He did not think the police were to blame, although he states "in a very few seconds the officers were unable to control the men," and he acknowledged that nine men had been killed and twenty-seven wounded! Well, indeed, may Lord Salisbury say to Lord Stanmore, in reply to Indian precedents, "I think he has been dealing with countries where the executive is a little more powerful than it is here."

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, August 4.—From Washington there came very positive, though not official, statements that Spain had accepted the fundamental conditions offered by President M'Kinley; that the difficulties raised by the Madrid Government related to points of detail, and had not been put forward in a contentious spirit; and that that Government would shortly send an acceptance of the American terms which would be sufficient to permit of a suspension of hostilities. From Madrid, however, it was denied that peace was attained so quickly as was supposed. Señor Sagasta was obliged to act with a view to the exigencies of internal politics, and he was now engaged in consulting the leading members of the Conservative party.

A Reuter telegram from Peking said that the report that the Director of Railways had broken off negotiations with the Hong-Kong and Shanghai Bank in regard to the loan for the Niuchwang railway extension was not confirmed, but Russian opposition continued unabated. "The gravity of the present situation was undoubted, and the Chinese regarded the present issue between Russia and Great Britain as a supreme one, likely to decide the whole question of China's future."

FRIDAY, August 5.—It was admitted from Washington that Spain had not formally accepted the American terms of peace, but it was stated that she had indicated her intention of doing so. The questions raised by M. Cambon were represented as being comparatively unimportant. There was a firm public conviction in the States that Spain would and must accept the President's terms, and there was no disposition to press the Madrid Government unduly to come to a decision.—The War Department in Washington was said to be concentrating its energies on the removal of General Shafter's army from Santiago. Transport arrangements were being actively pushed forward. The total number of sick was returned at 3,778, of whom 2,696 were suffering from fever.—A Madrid journal said that Señor Sagasta, in his consultations with the leading politicians of all parties, had declared that he had undertaken no engagements, so that, if the country so desired, the war might be continued without any breach of faith.

At a meeting of the "conference of representatives of metropolitan vestries concurring in the proposal for the establishment of municipalities in London," held at Westminster Town Hall under the presidency of Lord Onslow, the Committee appointed in June submitted a report and a draft Bill. It proposed that 20 of the metropolitan areas should be incorporated into municipal boroughs without the necessity for further petition to the Privy Council, and afforded facilities for the local authorities of the remaining areas to petition to be raised to the same level whenever the local sentiment should dictate the request. Lord Onslow and his friends, however, seemed likely to discover that it was easier to wreck municipalities in India than in England.

SUNDAY, August 7.—From Madrid it was reported that the Spanish Government had now finally drafted its reply to America, and that it was submitted to the Queen Regent to-day. Spain accepted the terms offered by America, and asked for a suspension of hostilities pending the definite conclusion of peace. The reply of Spain was expected to reach Washington to-morrow.

With regard to the Philippines, the Spanish Government proposed that the future of the islands should be decided by a Commission representing the two Powers. In this connexion it was stated from Washington that the Jingo Senators, fearing the decline of "the Imperialist idea," were now loudly protesting against the giving up by the United States of any territory occupied in the war. Should the President decide

the question against them, however, he would probably be supported by the people, whom the recent conduct of the Cuban and other insurgents was said to have disgusted.

Telegrams from Santiago gave startling accounts of the condition of the United States army there. Thousands were sick, and General Ames had telegraphed to Washington declaring that the only marching the troops were now able to perform would be that to the transports which were to take them home. The officers and doctors at the front had held a meeting, and made representations in the same sense to General Shafter. They prophesied an appalling disaster should their warning remain unheeded.

MONDAY, August 8.—The hopeful statements regarding the situation beyond the North-West frontier proved too sanguine. News came from Simla that the Khan of Pashat had commenced fighting with the Khan of Nawagai's men at Dageh, causing a portion of the Bajaur force to move thither. The Nawab of Dir had moved half his force to Panjkora, in his alarm at the report that the Mad Mullah intended to attack Dir.

The reply of the Spanish Government to the American terms of peace was handed to the French Foreign Minister in Paris this morning, and by him at once telegraphed to M. Cambon in Washington for transmission to President M'Kinley. The exact contents of the document had not been made known, and while in some quarters it was confidently described as amounting to an acceptance of the American demands, in others doubts were expressed on the subject. The general impression, however, both in the United States and Spain, appeared to be that the Madrid Government so far accepted the President's conditions as to render possible a cessation of hostilities and the initiation of regular negotiations.—The removal of General Shafter's army from Santiago was now actively proceeding. Reports in some of the New York journals indicated the existence of strained relations between the Cuban insurgents and the American forces.

At a meeting of the Dublin City Council, in response to a letter from the Duke of Westminster asking the assistance and support of the corporation towards the erection of a statue of Mr. Gladstone in Dublin, a resolution was unanimously carried expressing the opinion that no statue should be erected in Dublin in honour of any Englishman until the Irish had raised a fitting one to the memory of Charles Stewart Parnell.

TUESDAY, August 9.—It was reported from Madrid that there was no doubt that in the Note which reached Washington on Monday the Spanish Government accepted the American terms not absolutely, but subject to the approval of the Cortes. It was suggested, however, that if the United States Government insisted on the previous sanction of the Cortes to the cession of territory, a suspension of hostilities need not be longer delayed.—From Washington it was reported that the Spanish Note had been deciphered, but nothing was as yet made known as to its contents. Reports came from Manila that on the night of July 31 the Spanish garrison opened a heavy rifle and shell fire on General Greene's brigade, intrenched about 1,300 yards from the enemy's earthworks. The Americans promptly replied, and the firing lasted about two hours, the assailants being silenced. The American loss was ten killed and forty-six wounded. American accounts indicated that the Spanirds lost much more heavily. The Spaniards had now got the true range of the American earthworks, and kept up an annoying shell and shrapnel fire every night.

It was announced that Lord Charles Beresford had accepted a mission from the Associated Chambers of Commerce to visit China, with the purpose of preparing a report on the future prospects of British trade and commerce with that country, and particularly as to the extent to which the Chinese Government would guarantee the safe employment of British capital in the interior. Lord Charles was to start on the 25th inst., with the consent and approval of the Admiralty, and was expected to be absent for several months.

WEDNESDAY, August 10.—It was officially announced that Mr. George Nathaniel Curzon, M.P., has been appointed to succeed Lord Elgin as Viceroy of India. The appointment causes a vacancy in the representation of the Southport division. Mr. Curzon's majority was 764. It was considered probable that the former Liberal candidate, Sir H. S. Naylor-Leylands, would again come forward. Sir W. Forwood was expected to be the Unionist candidate.

A long step forward towards peace between the United States and Spain was made. The protocol preliminary to the definitive negotiations was drawn up and agreed to by M. Cambon, who awaited authority from Madrid to sign it. The New York correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* reported that the President stood firm to the American demands while granting reasonable concessions as to time and the manner of evacuating Cuba and Puerto Rico. Peace was regarded as assured.

The special correspondent of the same journal with the American Army in Cuba described in striking terms the investment of Santiago de Cuba and the sufferings of the troops from the atrocious climate and the unpreparedness of the commissariat and hospital departments.

Some curious light was thrown upon the relations between the Spaniards and the natives in the Philippines by a despatch from Reuter's special correspondent. This despatch contained a "manifesto" by Filipe Buencamino, "a Filipino who was friendly to Spain and joined in the compromise arrangement whereby the Spaniards hoped to conciliate the insurgent leaders without sacrificing too much." This is the man who was sent by the Spanish commander to endeavour to negotiate with Aguinaldo, but who was imprisoned and subsequently announced his adherence to the insurgent cause. The reasons for this step were set forth at length, and the inability of the Spaniards to maintain their position was insisted upon. Buencamino believed Aguinaldo was bound to win, and begged the Spanish commander to surrender in the cause of humanity. He regarded the successes of Aguinaldo as "achieved by special sanction of Heaven," and therefore bowed his head to the inevitable.—The Spanish loss in the recent fighting was believed to have been heavy. Great distress from scarcity of food and disease prevailed in Manila city. Mr. Rawson-Walker, the British Consul at Manila, died on August 2.

The Peking correspondent of the *Times* reported that the Tsung-li-Yamen had given formal assent to all the conditions imposed by M. Pavloff, the Russian Minister, with regard to the Niu-chwang extension railway loan—that the line should not be mortgaged as security, and that no foreign control or interference of any kind should be permitted, even in case of default. These conditions directly conflict with the terms of the signed contract.—The Tsung-li-Yamen professed amazement at the terms of the Peking-Han-kau railway contract published at Shanghai, and of the separate agreement which practically gives the Russian Minister absolute power in all disputes. It was, however, officially announced that the contract was still unratified.

Measures were suddenly taken by the Danish Government to place the defences of Copenhagen in a state of efficiency. They were supposed to be due to a fear that the present relations between Great Britain and Russia may end in events of a serious character.

The boundary dispute between Chili and Argentina was creating a good deal of anxiety in Italy, as the Italian colonists in both countries are taking sides, each in favour of his adopted Government. Should a conflict ensue it would amount, a Rome telegram said, to a sort of civil war. The Italian Government had taken measures to prevent such an eventuality.

The Pope was stated to have contracted an internal chill, and to have suspended audiences on the advice of his physician.

THE NEW VICEROY.

SELECTION OF MR. GEORGE CURZON.

SOME PRESS OPINIONS.

The rumour that Mr. George Curzon would succeed Lord Elgin as Viceroy of India has now proved to be correct. Mr. Curzon has been appointed. We give below a few representative opinions in the Daily Press:—

The *Times* (Aug. 11) says:—"A man who has been for three years at the Foreign Office, and has seen the despatches and been in touch with the diplomatists, is likely to regard the foreign policy of India from a more commanding point of view than any man, however cautious, who takes up the government without such training. It is probable that this foreign and frontier policy will perforce continue to be the chief concern of the new Viceroy, while as to the other grave questions which have of late been agitating India, he will be neither better nor worse equipped than any other able man who might have been called upon to govern that Empire. . . . . Given this indispensable condition (health), in very many other ways Mr. Curzon has great advantages. He has youth, wealth, cleverness, and—as the society of Calcutta and Simla will soon discover—a charming wife. These are no common endowments, which ought to assure success, on the social side, to the new Viceroy's career."

The *Manchester Guardian* (August 11) writes: "We need hardly say that Mr. Curzon carries with him the good wishes of opponents as well as of friends. It would not be frank to say that he has hitherto spoken on Indian questions with real authority. A slight acquaintance at first hand with parts of the North-West frontier led him to form views which were shown by the circumstances of the recent war to be incorrect. But the main lines of Indian frontier policy have been so definitely and, on the whole, moderately laid down in the important despatch sent to Lord Elgin in the spring, that Mr. Curzon's appointment to the Viceroyalty need not be regarded with misgiving as a sign of Ministerial relapse towards that extreme form of the forward policy which Mr. Curzon defended in some of his speeches."

The *Daily Chronicle* (August 11): "Two questions of the utmost gravity and urgency press upon India at this moment—her financial situation and her frontier policy. Mr. Curzon has

Sir C. Dilke maintained, with all due deference to the opinion of the Attorney-General, that the language of the Merchant Shipping Act as to the amount of space required for the seamen carried by British ships was quite clear.

The House divided, and the numbers were—

For the resolution..	101
Against	33
Majority for	68

Thursday, August 11.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions against State regulation; from Clifton (three), and Greenock; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Contributions by India to the Imperial Institute),—Return presented relative thereto [Address 8th August; Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree]; to lie upon the Table.

AN INDIAN BACTERIOLOGICAL INSTITUTE.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware of the proposal to found a bacteriological institute in India:

Whether he would state whether the Government of India had sanctioned the project; if so, to what extent were they committed:

Whether the funds for this project were being raised by subscriptions from Indian princes, and to what extent had this been done:

Whether he would state whether it was intended that experiments on animals should be carried on under this project:

Whether the institute was designed as a memorial of the Diamond Jubilee of the Queen:

And whether, having regard to the divergence of views in reference to such an institution, he was in a position to recommend, as a memorial of her Majesty's Jubilee in India, some work of benevolence commanding general support.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am aware that the Government of India have had before them proposals for the foundation of a Pasteur Institute, to which a bacteriological laboratory would be attached. Such institutions have to be almost entirely supported by private subscription. Independently of this project the Government of India have had under their consideration the advisability of establishing an institution for the bacteriological investigation of certain diseases specially prevalent in tropical climates.

No information has reached me which justifies the assumptions and suggestions of the last three questions.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Mr. Cohen asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state if the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, appointed in May, 1895, would be presented to Parliament before the opening of the next Session of Parliament.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have no authority whatever over the Commission. I understand that they adjourned a year ago in order that the Chairman might prepare and circulate his report for the consideration of his colleagues, and I am informed that up to now no report has been circulated.

IMPRESSMENT IN THE PUNJAB.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether there was any law or usage in force in the Punjab which authorised impressment of men and animals for service outside British India:

Whether Section 374 of the Indian Penal Code provided punishment for unlawful compulsory labour:

And, who were the authorities responsible for the recent impressment of Punjab villagers for service in the war beyond the frontier.

Lord G. Hamilton: As regards the first part of the hon. member's question, I must refer him to the reply given in the House on the 8th instant. The right to impress therein mentioned would extend to service within or beyond the frontier of India, and that right would not be affected by Section 374 of the Penal Code.

The impressment was carried out by the district officers acting under the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, who had the sanction of the Governor-General in Council for the steps he was taking.

MR. THORBURN'S SPEECH.

Sir Charles Dilke asked the Secretary of State for India whether the recent apology by Mr. Thorburn, for discussing in public the acts of the Government which he serves, related to his account of the desertion of the Khyber as well as to his statements on the impressment of men and beasts:

Whether Mr. Thorburn, in apologising for having made his speech, withdrew any of the statements which it contained:

Whether the Secretary of State continues to believe that the withdrawal of Captain Barton from his men in the Khyber Pass was only ordered after the military authorities on the spot had decided that troops could not be pushed up the Khyber to their support; who were the military authorities on the spot referred to:

And whether he had taken the opportunity, as promised in March, of laying down for the future the action to be taken at times of emergency in such cases; and, if so, in what terms.

Lord G. Hamilton: The apology made by Mr. Thorburn is an expression of regret for his infraction of the universal rule by which public officials in permanent employ are forbidden to publicly criticise the policy of the Government whom they are serving. The accuracy or inaccuracy of remarks so made does not enter into any such apology.

The military authority on the spot was the Brigadier-General commanding the Peshawar district, and the opinion he arrived at, that after providing for the safety of the Peshawar Valley he was not in command of sufficient strength to force the pass, was confirmed by the Commander-in-Chief in India.

I am in correspondence with the Government of India as to the future arrangements for safeguarding the Khyber Pass, and an integral part of such arrangements will be a definition of the relations between local corps and any British officers who may be appointed to them.

THE PLAGUE EDICT AT GARSHANKAR.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that on April 27 last a proclamation was issued requiring the 6,000 inhabitants of Garshankar, on account of plague, to leave the town within 24 hours, and go to some place outside of the town to be indicated when fixed:

Whether it had been brought to his notice that in his evidence the Native magistrate had stated that at that time huts to accommodate these people were not in existence:

Whether, before the 24 hours had expired, on the morning of the 28th, the police attempted to drive the people out of the town:

Whether a disturbance resulted, and the police fired upon the people without orders, killing nine of them:

Whether his attention had been drawn to the remarks of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, to the effect that the police continued to fire in spite of the efforts made by their officers to stop them:

And, whether under these circumstances he would reconsider the question of an inquiry by an impartial authority.

Lord G. Hamilton: After a month spent, as I have already stated, in persuasion and warning, a proclamation was issued on April 27, requiring the inhabitants of Garshankar to evacuate the town, and giving them till the following day to comply. Next morning, accordingly, a force of 250 police was marched into the town in order to arrange for the evacuation by persuasion, if possible, or, failing that, by force. The results I described in my answer to the hon. member's question on Tuesday last. The police, being violently assailed with brickbats and other missiles, which wounded many of them, fired without orders, and their officers were at first unable to check them, but soon succeeded. The summing up of the Lieutenant-Governor was that "though some of the police when attacked by the crowd" (which consisted exclusively of men) "committed the mistake of firing without orders, they showed no want of discipline in other respects, and worked well and loyally."

As to the provision of huts, I have seen no evidence to the effect mentioned in the question; but the inhabitants had been informed that all possible help would be given to them by the provision of huts and otherwise. I expect to receive further information on certain points, but at present I see no reason to change my opinion as to the suggestion of a special enquiry.

ET CAETERA.

The P. and O. s.s. "Egypt" leaves London for Bombay on August 18. Her list of passengers includes the following names:—Lieut.-Col. T. Greenaway; Captain Geddes; Major St. Leger Wood; Mr. H. M. Mehta; Major-General Sir Bindon Blood; Mr. K. B. Divaka; Mr. J. B. Khasgiwale; Major R. Boothby; Mr. K. Ullah; and Sir E. Clarke.

The s.s. "Massilia (P. and O.) arrived in London, from Calcutta, on August 10. Among other passengers were the following:—Mr. Younger; Mrs. Crooks; Mr. T. Jenkins; Mr. Vaughan Lee; Mrs. King; Mr. Weeks and infant; Dr. Macdonald and Mrs. Macdonald and infant; Mr. J. M. Alexander; Mr. C. J. German; and Mr. J. H. Hawkes.

We regret to have to record the death of Mr. Mir Aulad Ali, Professor of Arabic and Hindustani in the University of Dublin. He belonged to Lucknow, and had held his post in Trinity College, Dublin, for 37 years. He was an efficient teacher, and prepared students successfully for the Indian Civil Service. Professor Mir Aulad Ali died suddenly of heart disease on June 30. He used to show much friendliness to his countrymen who visited Ireland, and was held in much respect by his fellow-professors, as well as by all classes in that city.

Mr. Jehongir H. Bhabha, Madras University, has obtained a third-class in honour mathematical moderations at Oxford.—In the Final School of Jurisprudence, Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree (Balliol) and Mr. Shadi Lal (Balliol) took a second class, and Mr. Bapoojee D. Vacha (Brasenose) a fourth.—In the Final School of Modern History, Mr. J. C. Gupte (University College) and Mr. Salahuddin Khan (hon. collegiate), were placed in the fourth class.

At the distribution of prizes at the Cooper's Hill Royal Engineering College, Aserappa and Karamat Allah were among the four students upon whom the Secretary of State had sanctioned the bestowal of the fellowship of the College in the engineering branch. The scholarship presented by the Secretary of State for the mathematical course was won by Ahmed Ali. Aserappa also gained the scholarship for the best work in the year, and the scholarship for the best work for the three years' course in engineering and applied mechanics.

It is announced that Sir J. Westland, the Indian Finance Minister, will remain in India until next March.

A marriage has been arranged and will shortly take place between the Right Rev. Edward Ralph Johnson (late Bishop of Calcutta) and Mary Grace, eldest daughter of George Joseph Murray, Esq., of Wootton Court, Canterbury, and 9, Amen Court, E.C.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

Just Published. Price 2s. 6d. net.

INDIAN CURRENCY.

BY

HENRY DUNNING MACLEOD, M.A.,
of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

With Portrait, Map, and Illustrations, 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

GENERAL SIR RICHARD MEADE AND THE FEUDATORY STATES OF CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN INDIA:

A RECORD OF FORTY-THREE YEARS' SERVICE AS SOLDIER, POLITICAL OFFICER, AND ADMINISTRATOR.

By THOMAS HENRY THORNTON, C.S.I., D.C.L.,
Sometime Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, Author of "The Life and Work of Colonel Sir Robert Sandeman."

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,
SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S
PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

P. & O. COMPANY'S INDIA, CHINA, AND AUSTRALIAN MAIL SERVICES.

P. & O. FREQUENT SAILINGS TO GIBRALTAR, MARSEILLES, MALTA, EGYPT, ADEN, BOMBAY, KURRACHEE, CALCUTTA, CEYLON, STRAITS, CHINA, JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, TASMANIA, and NEW ZEALAND.

P. & O. CHEAP RETURN TICKETS AND ROUND THE WORLD TOURS.
For particulars apply at the London Offices, 122, Leadenhall Street, E.C., or 25, Cockspur Street, S.W.

6d. Weekly.] THE
"HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE
SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR
INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & CO.

OFFICES: 56, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

In Crown 8vo, cloth, price **7s. 6d.**

THOMAS BEST JERVIS,

LIEUT.-COL. BOMBAY ENGINEERS, H.E.I.C.'s SERVICE, DIRECTOR OF THE TOPOGRAPHICAL AND STATISTICAL WAR DEPARTMENT.

A Biography by his Son, W. P. JERVIS.

"The biographer has done his work with judgment and discretion, and has produced a work of considerable general utility and interest." *Glasgow Herald.*

"A faithful autobiography. As being a centenary tribute by his son, there is much relating to the condition of India in former times, the better enabling us to judge of the progress manifested in that country of late years."—*Western Daily Mercury.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), 8/6, *net cash.*

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE

Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness.

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.